TRAVEL AND POLITICS IN ARMENIA

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 001 406 461 2

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE



TRAVEL AND POLITICS IN ARMENIA

AN ARMENIAN BISHOP AT ETCHMIADZIN

TRAVEL AND POLITICS
IN
ARMENIA

BY
NOEL BUXTON, M.P.
AND THE
REV. HAROLD BUXTON

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY
VISCOUNT BRYCE

AND A CONTRIBUTION
ON ARMENIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE BY
ARAM RAFFI

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS AND A MAP

LONDON
SMITH, ELDER & CO., 15 WATERLOO PLACE
1914

[*All rights reserved*]

DS195
N6

INTRODUCTION

The Eastern Question, as we call it, though it is really a large group of questions, more or less involved with one another, has occupied the statesmen of Europe for nearly a century, and is still far from solved. That it should have made such slow and uncertain progress towards solution may be ascribed to two causes. One is that it was not allowed to solve itself. The mutual jealousies of the Great Powers who deemed their respective interests involved—France, Britain, Russia, Austria, and in later years Germany and Italy also—prevented a normal development of those natural forces which destroy bad governments. Neither annexation by neighbours nor internal revolts were permitted—so far as related to the Turkish Empire—to have, as in preceding centuries, their full and what may almost be called their legitimate play. The other cause was that the statesmen of Western Europe were very ignorant of the real conditions of the East, of

the character of the races that inhabited it, and of the sort of government which the Turks gave those races. And the West European peoples were even more ignorant than the statesmen. So late as the days of the Crimean War few Englishmen, few even of those who directed the policy of England, understood the actual state of things in the Turkish East. Had they understood it, there would have been no Crimean War. Even in 1876, when the massacres perpetrated by the Turks on the Bulgarians shocked Britain and roused Russia, few Englishmen knew that most of the region we call Thrace and Macedonia, outside the limits of the province marked Bulgaria on the map, was inhabited by Bulgarians and was just as much entitled to be delivered as that province was. Events have since then made us more familiar with European Turkey. But the Asiatic dominions of the Sultan still remain comparatively dark to the great bulk of Englishmen, Germans, and Frenchmen, though these countries present political problems just as difficult, and almost as urgent, as have been the problems of South-Eastern Europe.

To carry light into this darkness is the aim of the present book. Its authors, English travellers who bear an honoured name, had for years past been endeavouring to call attention

to the oppressions practised by the late Sultan Abdul Hamid on his subjects in Europe, and to secure some alleviation of their sufferings. Realising that under his tyranny things had been fully as bad in the Armenian provinces of North-Eastern Turkey, and almost as bad in North-Western Persia, they have explored those regions, and offer to English readers a succinct account of what they have seen. They bring to their task not only a sympathy with the victims of oppression but also a spirit of fairness and tolerance which seeks to do justice to all the races of the East alike, and to work for the good of Mussulmans, Turks, and Kurds, no less than for that Armenian Christian population which has had most to endure, and has attained a higher level of intelligence and culture than its neighbours.

Among the peoples of Western Asia the Armenians are unquestionably the strongest; and what I have seen of them both in their own country and in America, where many of them have sought refuge and secured prosperity, leads me to believe them to be, in point of industry, intellect and energy, the equals of any of the European races. They have a national history which goes back nearly three thousand years. They were the first nation that, as a nation, took Christianity to be its religion.

Placed between the Roman power on the West and the Parthian and Persian monarchs on the East, they had a troublous time, and after they had accepted Christianity were usually the allies and sometimes the bulwarks of the East Roman Empire in its long strife with the Sassanid kings of Persia. In the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries they gave to the Eastern Empire some of its best generals and ablest sovereigns. When their kingdom had been destroyed by the Turks, a large part of the nation was scattered over Asia Minor and Northern Syria, and in some of the wild valleys of the Taurus Mountains they maintained, like the Montenegrins in Europe, an independence often threatened but never destroyed. Scattered as they were, they have clung to their national traditions and their faith. The fullest proof of their constancy and courage was given when, in the massacres of 1895 and 1896, thousands died as martyrs rather than save their lives by accepting Islam.

Till about the middle of the nineteenth century they had got on pretty well with the Turks, for their mercantile capacity was useful in developing the trade of the country, and many of them rose to high posts in the service of the Government. But the war of Russia against Turkey in 1877–78, and the deliverance of Bulgaria which it brought about, excited not

only the hopes of Armenian patriots, but the fear and suspicion of Sultan Abdul Hamid. He entered upon a course of ferocious repression which ultimately became a policy of deliberate impoverishment and extermination. More than a hundred thousand Armenians perished in the massacres to which I have just referred, and a state of feeling was created between Mussulmans and Christians far more bitter than had been known before. Of this feeling the slaughter renewed at Adana six years ago gave painful witness.

At present the majority of the Armenian people dwell in Turkey. Others, less numerous, yet still a large and influential community, inhabit Russian Trans-caucasia; and a much smaller minority is found in Persia. In the Sultan's dominions they live mixed with Kurds and other Moslems, and there is no considerable area in which they constitute the large bulk of the population. The problem, therefore, of providing an efficient administration which shall give them security, protecting the peaceable tillers of the soil against the rapacity of the nomad Kurds whom Abdul Hamid had encouraged to despoil them, is a difficult one, and one cannot as yet feel sure that the present Turkish Government, even though it has forsworn the cruelties of the Hamidian *régime*, will exert itself to secure equal justice for men of both religions.

Upon the ultimate solution which the authors of this book suggest as possibly desirable, I will not now and here offer an opinion. To discuss a matter so complicated would carry me beyond the proper limits of an introduction. But it may be remarked that Great Britain has a plain moral responsibility in the matter, because it was by the action of the British Government, in the days of Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury, that the Treaty of San Stefano was set aside. For the stipulation in that treaty, by which the Turks had yielded to Russia the right to interfere for the protection of the Armenians, there was substituted an article inserted in the Treaty of Berlin (Article 61), by which the Sultan undertook to institute in the Armenian provinces reforms which were to be reported to and supervised by the six Powers. That article has remained a dead letter ever since. No reforms were introduced, and the appeals of the Armenians and their friends in Europe failed to move the Powers to intervention. At one time Germany, at another time Russia, refused consent. Every one of the thirty-six years that have passed since 1878 has shown how much protection is needed.[1] The moral obligation that rests upon ourselves is

[1] I may refer upon this subject to what is said in the fourth edition of my book entitled *Transcaucasia and Ararat*, published in 1896 (chapter xii. 'Twenty Years of the Armenian Question.')

rather increased than reduced by the lapse of time. The authors of this book are therefore rendering a service not only to the cause of freedom and humanity but to Great Britain herself when they remind us of the obligation that rests upon us, and help us to consider how it may be discharged. Whoever reads what they have written will, I venture to believe, recognise both the care they have taken to collect and present the real facts of the case and also the temperate and reasonable spirit in which they handle the questions involved.

The omens for a settlement which shall give some measure of tranquillity and some prospect of industrial development to Asiatic Turkey, once a rich and populous region, are more favourable now than they have been for many generations, and the horrors that attended the strife just ended in European Turkey are a warning of what happens when oppression and disorder have been suffered to continue long unchecked. It is to be earnestly desired that the present opportunity for securing peace and order in Eastern Asia Minor and Armenia may not be let slip.

BRYCE.

3 Buckingham Gate,
May, 1914.

PREFACE

The remoteness of Armenia and the absence of railways or even roads, reduce to a minimum the number of Englishmen who travel there. Every journey, therefore, to that historic land, interesting on so many grounds, imposes on the traveller an obligation to report what he saw.

The writers of this book travelled together in Russian and Turkish Armenia and in Persia in the autumn of 1913. But they would prefer to justify the perpetration of a volume, not so much by a single journey, as by previous experience of the Turkish Empire. One of them has lived for many years in Armenia; another has acted as an agent of relief funds in European Turkey; the third in this expedition was travelling in Turkey for the tenth time.

A handbook on the Armenian question is said to be lacking, and our ambition in this volume is to provide that minimum of information which the general reader desires. We therefore confine ourselves to essentials. The

traveller in Asiatic Turkey enters a medley of nationalities and religions, all of which are interesting. To some of them we make no reference because they deserve fuller treatment than is possible here. But when we ask for attention to Turks, Kurds, and Armenians, we are none the less convinced that immense interest attaches to Yezidis, Kizilbashis and Nestorians.

If our conclusions are unsensational, it is because we are familiar with the Eastern habit of exaggerated speech, and because we find in all parties qualities which are attractive and a gift of hospitality which is memorable.

We desire to express our thanks to the Editors of 'The Contemporary Review,' 'The Nineteenth Century,' and 'The World's Work' for their kind permission to reproduce articles published by them.

NOEL BUXTON.
HAROLD BUXTON

2 PRINCE'S GATE, S.W.
April, 1914.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE KURDS

PAGE

Leaving Civilisation—The Kurds—Their Tastes and Homes—Pleasures of Travel—Religion and Character—We visit a Kurdish Chief—We experience Robbery under Arms—Kurds and Turks—A Vali's Views—Privileged Tyrants—The New Kurdish Movement—Demoralisation—Unpleasant Neighbours—A Welcome Presence 1

[N. E. B.]

CHAPTER II

TURKISH ARMENIA

The Pleasant Side of the Picture—Armenian Grievances—Where the Government does Wrong—Where it fails to do Right—The Responsibility of England . 30

[H. J. B.]

CHAPTER III

RUSSIAN ARMENIA

The Variety of Races in Trans-Caucasia—Brigandage—Armenian Life at Tiflis—Armenian Revolutionary Societies—Their Relations with Russian Politics—Armenian Villages in Russia—Advantages of Russian Rule to the Armenians—Comparison with

PAGE

Poland — Questions of Language, Religion and Culture 52

[H. J. B.]

CHAPTER IV

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH

Etchmiadzin—Oriental Churches and their Characteristics—Special Features of the Armenian Church —National—Democratic—Simple in Doctrine— Capable of Progress—The Armenian Liturgy— Other Sects 69

[H. J. B.]

CHAPTER V

MOSLEM STATES

The Æsthetic Question—The Pro-Turks—Tests of Ability to maintain an Independent State—The Capacity of Persia—The Constitution—A Picturesque Despot—The Capacity of Turkey—Have the Young Turks Succeeded ?—Kurdish Brigandage protected—Armenians dispossessed by the Government itself — Massacre — Armenians specially entitled to Ordered Government 98

[N. E. B.]

CHAPTER VI

THE FUNCTION OF THE POWERS

Widespread Interest in Great Britain—Historical Review —Effects of Anti-Russian Policy—Reform requires European Control—If the Concert fails to establish it, Russia should receive a Mandate—Objections to this Course affecting England, the Powers, and the Armenians—These Arguments are Obsolete—The Right Course is Feasible and Clear . . . 123

[N. E. B.]

ARMENIAN HISTORY, CULTURE AND CHARACTERISTICS

(By ARAM RAFFI)

CHAPTER I

ARMENIA: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

PAGE

Armenian Colonies—Armenians and Persia—Relations between the English and the Armenians—Armenians and Russia—Armenians and Turkey—Armenians in America—Armenians in Egypt . . . 163

CHAPTER II

CULTURE

Literature — Armenian Novelists — Armenian Music and Poetry—Architecture—Painting—Illumination —Embroidery—Drama—Education . . . 222

CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS

(1) Patriotism — (2) Religion — (3) Women — (4) Loyalty and Faithfulness—(5) Critical Instinct—(6) Honesty—(7) Solidarity—(8) Occupations—(9) Lord Byron on Armenians 258

APPENDIX I.—Article 61 of the Berlin Treaty 269

APPENDIX II.—Scheme of Reform of the Armenian Delegation, 1913 270

BIBLIOGRAPHY 273

ILLUSTRATIONS

An Armenian Bishop at Etchmiadzin .	*Frontispiece*	
Our Escort and Luggage . . .	*To face p.*	11
The Chief and his Tribesmen . . .	,,	11
Hoshab : a Relic of the Armenian Kingdom	,,	18
Entrance to an Underground House .	,,	20
A Kurdish Family and Turkish Zaptieh (Gendarme)	,,	22
Kurdish Chief and Turkish Gendarme .	,,	22
Turkish Armenia : Treading Out the Corn	,,	36
Varag Monastery	,,	39
Schoolboys at Varag Monastery . .	,,	39
The Chief's Wife	,,	47
Russian Guard at Vladikavkas . .	,,	53
Armenian Peasant Girl in the Caucasus.	,,	58
Erivan, a Russianised Town . . .	,,	66
Armenian Church in Russia . . .	,,	70
Monastery at Etchmiadzin . . .	,,	70
A Street in Tabriz	,,	101

Gendarmes and Armenian Peasants *To face p.* 113
A Russian Consul in Turkish Armenia . „ 113
Armenians in Turkey . . . . . „ 141
Armenians under Russian Rule . . „ 141
Armenian Refugees from Turkey arrived in Russia . . . . . „ 143

Map to illustrate 'Travel and Politics in Armenia' . . . . . *At end of text.*

TRAVEL AND POLITICS IN ARMENIA

CHAPTER I

THE KURDS

THE traveller who, in these days, seeks to escape the restraints and obligations of civilisation has no easy task, for a holiday in Europe does not, as a rule, enable one to escape from letters. For this purpose a trip to Armenia may be confidently recommended. It is six days *via* Warsaw or Moscow to Tiflis, but Russian trains are extremely comfortable, and from Tiflis one can enter almost at once into the wilds.

Riding a pack-horse is a mixture of joy and pain. The saddle consists of a bundle of sacking, odd strips of carpet and leather, padded with straw, and held together with string. It is loosely attached to the animal's body, and it is necessary to be constantly balancing oneself in order to keep it upright. Both the width

of the saddle and the absence of stirrups add to the discomfort. On the other hand, the pack-horse is a host in himself. Reins are quite superfluous. He knows his way better than his rider, and the occasional persuasion of the stick is all that is necessary.

It was in this manner that we entered Turkish Armenia, travelling from the Persian town of Tabriz. Our first impressions in Turkey were neither of Turks nor of Armenians, but of Kurds, and it was fitting that, in an inspection of that country, the Kurdish factor should come first. Whether Kurds or Armenians are the more numerous in Turkey it is idle to dispute, while no census worth the name can be taken. But to the eyes of the traveller the Kurd is predominant. He is, indeed, spreading himself still further, by the seizure of lands and houses, sometimes with Government help, sometimes on his own account. But even if in a minority, Kurds would make the greatest show. They ride—and ride the best horses; they carry rifles; bully the Turks; wear fine, bright-coloured clothes; and can afford to live on frequented routes which are often for Christians the riskiest neighbourhood. They are of much more direct importance in the land than the Turks. We, therefore, saw all we could of the Kurds.

The Kurd is happiest on the hills with his sheep. He loves his flocks, and has been described as 'married to his cattle.' Till the October snow drives him from the heights, he is a plague to the Englishman trying to stalk *mouflon* or ibex. The pastoral and nomadic habits of the Kurds belong properly to the more southern districts, from which they can move in winter to the Mesopotamian plains and remain in their beloved tents. In the airy shades of these spacious awnings of black homespun goats' hair, a chief seems to wear a dignity that you miss in a house. The nakedness of his children and the scanty rags of his women seem only appropriate; the furniture, quilts, boxes of clothes, and cooking-pots, attain a neatness quite astonishing. Even weaving is proceeding on his improvised looms. He serves you sour milk in a generous bowl—the 'butter in a lordly dish' of Deborah. You recline on a fine carpet. He may live largely by theft, yet his life is harmonious with his surroundings. But where the race has spread to the elevated hill-country farther north, too far for migration to the plains, he is driven to shelter in houses for the four months of snow; and he adopts the simplest form of dwelling, a mere excavation with a flat roof of wattle and clay, supported on poles, a substantial

reproduction of the tent to which he returns at the first suggestion of spring. There are no windows, only small holes for smoke and light in the roof, and a minimum of outer doors. The village resembles a rabbit warren. The inhabitants climb up to peep at the traveller, like enlarged prairie dogs. No dwelling less ventilated than these can be devised, and domestic habits, suited to the open air, reduce them quickly to unimaginable squalor.

Arriving at sundown, exhausted with your ten hours' march, you look anxiously for a single dwelling which has been modernised to the extent of one room above ground. More than once we were disappointed. It was too cold to camp, and somewhat precarious. In this situation necessity drives you underground, and that quickly, for before the passing of daylight you can explore your subterranean quarters with less danger of breaking your skull. The passages along which you grope are the precise counterpart of a coal-mine, in the necessity for stooping, the irregular broken floor, and the darkness. The illusion is complete when you come to a room full of ponies. Next to this room is that of your host's family, in no way superior, and wafting into the chamber allotted to yourself an odour not less marked than that of the stable. You thank Heaven

that the nasal sense becomes blunted with time. You get out your kettle and tin of meat and prepare your supper. Stepping out before bedtime to sniff some pure air, you find the sheep lying crowded about the door, most human of all domestic beasts in these Eastern lands, where once, on a night made familiar to our childhood :

> 'Glimmering under the star-light,
> The sheep lay white around.'

Our host at one such dwelling was a handsome man, distinctly old, but just about to add to his harem, to the existing members of which he introduced us *en bloc*. He pointed to one, saying, 'This is the best looking.' The other two appeared unconcerned at this reflection on their charms, perhaps because the favourite was soon to be superseded. The old man vehemently urged upon us Kurdish wives. He would find them for us of 'Ashirat' blood. He added, in true Kurdish spirit, that we must pay a high price. He was himself not only 'Ashirat' but a considerable landlord, yet his house was not much removed from the lowest standard. I find no fault, for it furnished a night of profound sleep.

* * * * * *

It is still quite dark when the horse-drivers take your baggage. Your kettle boils, and you

get tea and a biscuit with the help of candle-light. With a minimum of washing-up you pack your tea-basket and emerge from the hut. The star-lit air is indescribably fresh, and you walk the first mile to warm yourself as the night fades. At last the sun shoots suddenly over the hills. All round you are sweeping mountains clothed with scanty yellow grass, a world of golden colour strangely uniform to northern eyes; the slopes are not precipitous but rise to a great height—their bases nowhere less than 5,000 feet above sea level. The whole effect is of our own border hills on a magnified scale, not naked as in Persia, but grazeable to the summits. Through these hills you move all day, generally across slopes, sometimes in deep gorges, sometimes over passes 9,000 feet high. You walk up steep paths to ease your horse's legs, or down them to ease your own. But the sun gets hot and makes you lazy. You halt an hour for lunch, and the gendarmes at their caracol give you water. You mount again and soon wish there were less sun and more incident—nothing all day but a caravan or two, an eagle, a distant village, the latter insignificant in this vast unutilised world. You get bored with the unwonted absence of talk, action, reading, writing, continued day after day. All the poems you know by heart, called to mind and pieced together, are long ago

exhausted. You get used to it. Why worry because you are blankly idle ? Sitting sideways on your pack-saddle you may as well yield to sleep. You wake to the bells of a passing caravan. It is Kurds again, riding armed, or a chief's wife with her attendants ; then nothing more occurs till you come on black Kurdish tents surrounded by flocks and ragged children.

* * * * * *

The scenery in these lands has rightly been named sculpturesque rather than picturesque. There is little to entrance one in detail. If now and then a marshy spot grows soft grass like Europe, and peewits rise from it, the impression is of something very precious. The land is naked and untidy, its raggedness specially striking to the visitor from that most perfectly clothed of all lands—Great Britain. Its natural beauties are fundamental, the brilliance of sun and moon and stars, sapphire lakes and sapphire sky and vast spaces of gold-grey land.

Deep and fundamental also are the pleasures of the life—fourteen hours daily in the open air (an allowance which no British sport can be made to yield) ; a freedom from letters and papers, which not even a sea voyage now secures ; unsullied weather without risk of change ; health of such perfection as is attained

in no other way. You understand the Kurd's refusal to be anything but a nomad.

* * * * * *

The disinclination of the Kurds to settle is great, and in many parts it leads to the forcible occupation of Armenian villages for the winter months, an ideal combination to my mind, of the advantages, without the responsibilities, of housekeeping. The 'right of quarter' was claimed from early times. On it the Turks endeavoured to found a tax. Now, however, affairs are more simply arranged. The Government itself, where Kurds are demanding houses, as, for instance, those who leave Persia for Turkey are doing, turns the Armenian out of his paternal home, using the gendarmes and local officials to select their pet aversions as victims. This practice we found in full swing in a remote district.

As a rule the proceeding is less regular. Whole districts were abandoned to Kurds when the Russian armies retired in 1829, 1855, and 1878 from Turkish soil, because violence was bound to follow. You find on all hands villages now Kurd which were till lately Armenian. Where settlement has become a habit, many Kurds have grown rich out of the lands taken wholesale from Armenians in the great days of massacre, and often a village which, though feudal, seemed

till lately uniformly poor, now surrounds an upstanding and whitewashed house, and begins to wear the proper aspect of a feudal property.

Of the Kurd's religion little appears to be carefully ascertained except its variety and unorthodoxy. He regards with reverence fire, and the deep well-like oven in which his fire is maintained with cow-dung fuel. His rendering of Mohammedanism is most notable for its rejection of the woman's veil. In this he is, unawares, in the van of the liberal movements of Islam, for the *yashmak* embodies the most vital of those ideas which retard Mohammed's followers and establish the inferiority of their creed.

It not only proclaims the mental inferiority of women, but it perpetuates their seclusion, and calls attention to the physical aspects of sex. A large proportion of the Kurds are Kizilbashis, heretical Moslems with pro-Christian leanings, despised by the orthodox Mussulman.

Fostered as the Kurds in general are by a pampering Government, and accustomed to live at the expense of other people's comfort, it is not surprising that they have evolved a disposition and manner regrettably unattractive. The Albanian, in Old Servia as it was before the Balkan War, living by violence, looked perhaps more savage, with his shaven crown and tag of hair behind; but he was known for loyalty,

and there was a dignity, albeit a ferocious one, in his tiger-like figure. It may be unfair to generalise, but there are certainly a vast number of Kurds totally without the crude dignity that usually goes with domination. With the power of a feudal caste they combine, not the style of the noble savage or the generous Robin Hood, but the habits of noisy chafferers and the petty stinginess of diligent pickpockets. They snatch and beg like spoilt children. When one of them has received payment for some service, his colleagues complain that he has got too much. Whatever takes their fancy—food, field-glasses, everything—they cry, 'Give, Give,' like the horse-leech's daughter. While you hand a tip to the leader of the Kurdish escort furnished by your host, his companion picks your pocket from behind. When you have been left in this way, as I was, without pipe or tobacco, you readily appreciate the unceasing execration which every other party—Persian, Armenian, Turk: driver, villager, gendarme or Turkish official—pours out upon the Kurd, with all the untranslatable oaths in which so many Mussulmans excel.

* * * * * *

The manner in which we were forced to part with some of our belongings, as it furnished one of the memorable moments of our journey, is perhaps worthy of description.

OUR ESCORT AND LUGGAGE

THE CHIEF (X) AND HIS TRIBESMEN

We had secured an introduction to a great Kurdish chief, and his warriors, ragged, but armed with a recent type of magazine rifle, rode at our side. As we left the level plain, luxuriant with melons and Lombardy poplars, the hills became wilder, like a magnified version of the Scottish Lowlands. The track began to lead through deep rocky gorges, by which alone a passage could be made between the steep mountains. The romantic aspect of our escort, their white fezes adorned with heavy black tassels which hung over their faces, was enhanced by the strangeness of our surroundings. Around us rose regular walls of rock, continuous lines of hexagonal columns, like those of Staffa or the Giant's Causeway.

Suddenly, as we reached a river valley, the intensely romantic ruins of a castle stood up against the lowering sun. Beneath it lay the dishevelled village of the chief, surrounding the modern fortress, and overlooking a meadow where the valley broadened out to receive a confluent from each side of the towering castle rock.

Our steeds were pack-horses, surmounted with the gigantic edifice which in the East disgraces the name of saddle, and accustomed only to walk. But to reach the castle at a foot's pace offended the swashbuckling instinct of the tribesmen, and they broke into a canter. The

sensation that one was taking part in the robber scene of a pantomime inspired us also to 'play up'; and it was with a final shuffling gallop, into the group of awaiting spectators, that we and our sorry nags endeavoured to do justice to the situation.

The chief—let me call him Hassan Agha—a swarthy young man of some thirty years, had donned a yellow robe to receive us. With great hauteur he motioned us to chairs by a little paved pool into which fell spring water. He and his brother took seats on the opposite side of the pool, across which we made the correct remarks, while tea was handed in glasses. But Hassan was not communicative; and it was soon evident that he had other ideas of the way in which to maintain his dignity. His chamberlain, who seemed to be also the head cook, was placed at ten yards distance with a spent cartridge on a short stick held in his hand. The chief, sitting on his chair, then favoured us with an exhibition of trick shooting. He made good play with his Mauser, hitting the cartridge four times out of six, in each case presenting it to us. The cavaliers and henchmen stood round in admiring silence. Against the sky-line, far above us, now appeared the cattle and the women, returning from the upper slopes, and moving in single file down the steep descent. The haughty

warriors, unused to work, paid more attention to their rifles and horses than to their toiling wives. Just then a magpie alighted two hundred yards away across the valley. The chief fired and hit it. He is certainly a remarkable shot.

Long before sunset the deep valley was in shade, and the impression of a melodrama increased, so perfectly did the pseudo-brigands play their part.

It was almost dark when we were led up the steps of the château, the close counterpart of the mediæval castle of Europe, but less fitted for defence. A single hall occupied its whole area, but there were no rooms above, and the windows each side, with their garish coloured glass, were ample. We and the principal officials occupied a table and chairs at the end of the hall. Lining all the rest of the wall-space, squatted in silence the retainers, their rifles laid before them on the floor. When the chief entered, all rose; when he sat they sat. At intervals he would give orders in loud, angry tones; we could recognise his meaning once, when he flung his tobacco-box along the thirty feet of floor to be refilled.

An interminable waiting followed; a henchman indifferently performed a dance. We induced the chief at length to open out in talk. When in Persia, one of our party had given great

delight by showing photographs of his family. His father appeared in Windsor uniform, with the cross of St. Michael and St. George. Our linguist proceeded to say that the son was a member of Parliament. 'What of that?' said our host, 'a parliament is nothing. His father is far greater; he is a general.' Expecting to find in Hassan Agha a similar contempt for politics and parliaments, Turkish or Persian, but anxious to get at his views, we raised the subject with diffidence. 'If our parliament,' he replied, 'were like the British parliament, ours would be a fine country. But the Turkish *mejliss* has done no good. The Persian *mejliss* has no force. Its men govern with teapots. You can only govern with cannons.' *We*: 'Have they not established schools?' *Chief*: 'Schools are good. We Kurds want schools, but all men say we are wild thieves. They will not let us have schools.' *We*: 'The Christians have schools. What do you think of the Christians?' *Chief*: 'They do no harm, but they want reforms. We will never allow reforms.' Again, after a pause: 'Why are you all unmarried?' *We*: 'If we were married, we should not travel to see you.' *Chief*: 'It is better to be married than to travel. I have three wives, but only one child. I shall soon buy another wife.'

Supper was worthy of the old baronial days. A big tray, with meat, bread, and sour milk, was set before every three men, upon the floor. It was weird to survey that line of fighters, fading into darkness towards the end of the hall, the activity of smacking lips precluding conversation. We at the table were mercifully allowed a knife and fork. The chief carved for himself with the fingers of one hand, displaying amazing skill.

Immediately after supper the chief retired, and there followed him all but a dozen or so of notables (including the chief's brother), for whom quilts were laid on the floor. No less than four of these high personages confided to our interpreter that the others would steal our things in the night. But we slept unrobbed on our camp beds.

On leaving the chief's territory, however, we were less fortunate. He ordered six horsemen to escort us into the neighbouring territory, and hand us over to a Turkish guardpost some five hours' ride away. Near the frontier they stopped, saying that the Turkish guards would fire on them, as usual, if they came within shot. We must go on alone ; and, moreover, they must have heavy baksheesh before we went on at all. We disposed of them with as little expenditure of time and coin as was feasible. We were

congratulating ourselves on having escaped with sufficient daylight to reach our destination, when another gang of mounted thieves was upon us. They were as usual watching the track for caravans to plunder. These men were not restrained by any instructions of the chief from an inclination to strip us of our goods and clothes. Each had a rifle and dagger. We had not a revolver between us. Our only chance was to work on their fear of the chief's displeasure. This was difficult when a dozen men were thrusting their fists into our faces, and all were yelling like wild cats, so that we could not make the interpreter hear what we wished him to say. By affecting a haughty demeanour we obtained a hearing at last. We then moved on. In a flash they had galloped ahead of our pack horses and rounded them up. At that, an Armenian member of our party, with the recklessness of his race, lost his temper, flung himself from his horse and flew at the throat of the leader. The situation was critical. Certainly it was a close shave for our skins, for these tribesmen are the creatures of impulse. They might have taken the fancy which moved their Persian *confrères* when they attacked the Indian Cavalry contingent near Shiraz (hitting and capturing the British Consul who rode with them) a few months before. We suppressed

the Armenian in haste. It was needless to invite murder. The prospect of being stripped was enough. We were obliged to dismount, and the whole of them, closing round us, elbowed and pushed us in a bullying and threatening manner. It seemed safest at last to hand some silver coins to one who called himself the leader. Like a pack of hounds they immediately set upon the unfortunate man, and it looked as if we should see him killed. This diversion allowed us to move forward a hundred yards or so, when we were again pursued and surrounded. This time they were angry, and ready to use violence. They forced their hands into our pockets, and though happily our valuables (bank notes and passports) were out of reach, they did not go without plunder in the shape of pipes and tobacco. It was now evident that only a skilful combination of bluff, with the payment of blackmail, would save our skins. It was a case for putting forth supreme efforts. With renewed energy our interpreter laid himself out to work upon their fears of summary punishment on their return to the castle. Suddenly the thought of it seemed to chill them. Their threats became entreaties. Snatching from my hand the proffered silver, they galloped over the crest of the hill.

Better times to the chief and his merry men!

Thirty or forty of them, samples of a total which is said to number 3,000 mounted rifles, are fed and housed free daily at the castle, some coming, some going, returning to the villages where they rule, as minor feudal lords. They lead a life which survived on the Scottish border till the days of Elizabeth. Plundering forays, tribal vendetta, frontier raids, pilfering, smuggling, casual killing—such are the trimmings of an existence which to these men is traditional, and is flavoured with a dash of loyalty and romance.

* * * * * *

There are a few Kurdish chiefs of even greater power and pomp than Hassan, but their number is diminishing. Some are seeking the protection of Russia, or rather Russia is seeking to obtain their support. Turkish policy, while it leaves uncontrolled the petty lawlessness of the Kurds in general, has reduced the independent chiefs to a pitiable inferiority to their forbears of old.

A notable illustration of this fact is seen in the stupendous ruins of Hoshab, occupied till sixty years ago by the great family of the Bedr Khans. The traveller from Deir to Van, wandering through a desert of unpeopled hills, comes with astonishment on this palace-castle, a ruined Alnwick, but an Alnwick with 300 feet of sheer rock to heighten its romance, the windows of its roofless banquet-hall framing each a space

HOSHAB : A RELIC OF THE ARMENIAN KINGDOM

of sapphire sky, almost, it seems, at the zenith, so precipitously does it pierce the blue.

The mud-walled hovels at its feet now shelter but a horde of Kurdish peasants, who milk their goats at sunset on the dry shingly bed of the river. But though in the main the castle dates from the great days of the Armenian kings, the remains of modern additions by the Kurdish chiefs attest the power from which they too have fallen. Other great feudal lordships of the past have also disappeared. A semi-independent Bey held Bitlis till 1849, when he was taken a prisoner to Constantinople. A few years later it is recorded that Sultan Abdul Mejid seriously considered the policy of settling the Kurd question by general massacre, encouraged by the successful application of this method to the janizaries.

It was not till after the last Russo-Turkish War that Kurds were deliberately set against the Armenians. It fell to the genius of Abdul Hamid to conceive that, by means of religious animosity, a use could be found for them. If they would not be soldiers or tax-payers, they could help to domineer. If their ideas were too low for the Turkish standard, they could at least destroy those whose standard was too high for the Turks to tolerate.

So far as the Turkish Government does

anything to assert public order, it is by operating against the remaining great chiefs and against noted brigands. At the capital of a Kurd-ridden vilayet, the Vali paid us a prolonged call—a clever member of the 'Young Turk' party whom one of us had known in Macedonia. This type is a welcome contrast to the 'old' Turk, who wasted your time on such meaningless phrases as 'Grâce à Dieu, la tranquillité regne partout.' The French Consul dropped in also, a congenial comrade for the Vali, amiably cynical about Armenians. We discussed the Kurds at length. The troops had lately surrounded and killed a noted Agha, who, though he had given assistance to the Government in the first-class massacres of 1895, had lately become too uppish for Turkish taste. His sons, too, had been put out of the way, and also, with Turkish thoroughness, his wife. A large expedition of troops and gendarmerie was now closing in on the Agha's chief colleague. This man, the Vali explained, was a mere brute. He had wantonly shot for fun a lunatic, one of those 'village idiots' who in the East are treated with more superstitious reverence than in Northern Europe. It was hoped that he would be easy to capture, because the now dead Agha had always provided the brains of the concern. A telegram reporting the capture

ENTRANCE TO AN UNDERGROUND HOUSE

might even arrive to-morrow from the leader of the expedition, a well-known 'Young Turk' officer and a cousin of Enver Bey.

Anti-Kurdish policy did not stop here. To defend themselves against Kurds, rifles had even been distributed among certain Armenian villages, two or three to each. This is a notable relaxation, in ostensible form, of the policy by which one race has been artificially held in bondage to another. But the Vali omitted to mention that several thousand rifles, of a newer pattern, had at the same time been distributed to the Kurds. Repression of the feudal brigands is at present in favour, but it must not be undertaken by Armenians, and he was very displeased with the latter for joining in the repression of crime. They had killed a well-known bully of the same type as those pursued by the authorities, and as a result twenty Armenian villagers were under lock and key.

We went on to speak of Kurdish institutions, the 'Hamidie' cavalry, the privileged 'Ashirat' families, and their relation to the 'rayah,' the traditional Turkish term (meaning cattle) for Christian peasants. But first the Vali pulled us up. 'Les rayahs n'existent pas. C'est un mauvais mot.' Even the Turcophil Consul stared. 'Depuis quand?' he asked at last defiantly. 'Depuis la constitution!'

Ugly facts being thus disposed of, we learnt that the Hamidie cavalry also is theoretically abolished. Of three whole regiments attached to a particular headquarters only two companies remained. Abdul Hamid's famous device for suppressing Christians and winning the loyalty of the Kurds was thrown overboard with no regret. It is well known that the work of enrolment had always proved irksome to the Turkish officers charged with it. Their only hold over the new recruits lay in the desire for new rifles, and their labours never reached the stage of training. Even uniforms were seldom distributed, and no regiment was collected with further harmony of dress than that afforded by the metal Hamidie badge. Travellers of the late 'nineties found the Hamidie known on account of this badge as the 'tin-plate men.' Kurdish troops have been tried before, but have never been of use to the Turks. In 1854 they notoriously failed to fight, breaking into demoralised groups when attacked. In 1877 they robbed the cavalry regiment in which they enrolled. They also brought undue discredit on the Turkish troops proper by their skill in mutilating the Russian wounded. Sultan Hamid's scheme has perhaps succeeded, not only in removing Christians but in breaking down the power of chiefs, through the turning

A KURDISH FAMILY AND TURKISH ZAPTIEH (GENDARME)

KURDISH CHIEF AND TURKISH GENDARME

of attention to the Sultan rather than the tribe. But the Vali was glad to be rid of a nuisance. It is only fair to say that we subsequently met many Kurds who knew nothing of this theoretical disbandment, and proudly claimed to be not only Ashirats but Hamidie cavalrymen.

I have seen no satisfactory account of the privilege denoted by the term 'Ashirat,' and this is not the place for sociological details. A dozen men, who ought to be informed, will give you as many different versions. It is, however, sufficiently important for us (and certainly for the Turkish Government) to know that an immense proportion of Kurdish families claim a customary and hereditary right of immunity from taxation, and, in effect, of any responsibility to Government or society whatever (the Vali would have said to God or man). They recognise only their chief, often a mere squireen at war with neighbours equally petty. The Sultan attempted to alter this state of affairs, by demanding military service in exchange for immunity from taxation, but failed. As the Vali complained, the Ashirats have ceased to serve and have not begun to pay. It appears that sometimes only the landowners are Ashirat; the French Consul was eloquent on this point, urging that their villagers were 'Kurd-rayah'—serfs who suffered even more than Christians.

There are, of course, Kurdish peasants who have no privilege and are bullied by their greater compatriots. But the Vali contradicted him. Certainly in many districts an Agha's dependents are all Ashirat, as well as his family, and in any case many chiefs claim judicial powers, the whole of their villagers, mostly armed, denying the right of the Turkish judge to punish or try them. The Christian finds fault with this 'feudalism.' In his argument one further discerns a modernist revolt against economic feudalism as we know it in the West; but his first grievance is against the Agha's claim to feudalism in its old judicial form, and at this point the Turk and the Christian tend to agree. For the Turkish Ministers of War and Finance, much of Eastern Anatolia remains a thorn in the flesh. You admire the flaunted pistol-holder of a tattered ruffian in a village crowd and find he has a Colt's magazine repeater. He proudly observes: 'I am Ashirat.' He will neither pay taxes nor serve in the army.

The latest 'Kurdish movement' towards unity is often discussed, but the conclusion is never alarming. A German Consul was specially keen to learn our opinion of Russia's assumed activity in promoting it. In this aspect, with a sustained patronage, it is natural that to German eyes the matter should look serious.

To the rival aspirant ‘ omne ignotum pro magnifico.’ But a real Kurdish movement must be almost as unworkable as was the Albanian one. Differences of dialect and religion are almost equally great—the heretical Kizilbashis (said by some to number one-third of the Kurds) being hated by the Sunni Turks almost as if they were Christians, and much more than the Catholic Albanians were hated by the Moslems. Internal strife is equally traditional. Above all, the absence of a written language precludes the spread of ideas, without which unity is meaningless. Till 1913 no Kurdish newspaper ever appeared at Stamboul, and small wonder, for it cannot be printed in Kurdish. To reach the Kurds, the Bible Society prints the Scriptures in Armenian characters. A section of Armenians has attempted to work with the new Kurdish movement, but the memory of past strife is an obstacle, and moreover the movement is aristocratic, inspired by the fear of losing feudal privileges, which are themselves one of the chief scourges of the Armenian.

When contemplating the Kurds one feels that it is indeed a cruel fate that has so debased the fundamental gold of human nature. The combination of ignorance with lawless power has ruined their soul. It produces an evil greater in reality than the trouble they give

to their neighbours. The poorer villages are a scene of rags (too scanty to seem worth wearing) and scowling, repellent faces. A settlement of Australian aboriginals contains more smiles and laughter. The vicious pleasure with which half-grown children are seen knocking down smaller ones is a unique phenomenon. The very chief who entertains you is rude, so that it was with no compunction that in parting with one of these, who happened to prefer eating with his fingers, we selected for our parting present a knife and fork. He had the same evening boasted to our interpreter that if the Christians in his country obtained reforms, he and his men would ' kill them all in two hours.'

To those who have not studied it, the Kurdish situation is hard to describe because it is unique. Albania itself, incredibly wild as it was before the war, close to the heart of Europe, was not so strange. Before seeing Kurdistan I remember hearing a traveller propose that the Armenian question might be settled by letting the Armenian carry arms ; I put him down as wanting in the political instinct ; but in fact it is the only statesman-like proposal, so long as the Turkish administration remains, because the Armenian, being of greater natural force than the Kurd, would, if armed, bring about peace.

In default of metaphors which accurately

convey the situation, I confess to a comparison which frequently occurred to me. The Kurdish herdsman ranges over land very like that of his *confrère* the Australian squatter. Both are averse to intruding agriculturists. Both can do without them. The difference is this. Australian Governments insist that lands fit for farming shall be farmed. But the Kurdish squatter is a government himself and insists that they shall not. He tolerates an occasional village, where the land would support twenty : when so disposed he takes the village for his own people ; the rest he destroys.

In civilised countries landlords profit by prosperous tenants. But self-interest is at best an imperfect guarantee of enlightened estate-management. And in the case of the Kurd, it is inoperative, because he has the standard of comfort of a gipsy. Where the standard is rising, however, there is some hope, as the following apocryphal story will indicate. A young Kurd, whose father had indulged in massacre, was seen with the peasants learning to plough. The father remonstrated against the indignity of work. The son replied : ' When you have killed all the Christians, we shall have to work or starve.'

We finally left Turkey for Russia in one of the small carriages of the country. As we

neared the frontier and were passing a ravine, our driver said, 'There is the spot where the Kurds robbed us the last time I passed here.' The facts were as follows: Five Kurds were attacking a traveller when a Consul, returning to his post, came within sight. His escort consisted of four gendarmes and two regulars. Three Kurds galloped off; two were surrounded; the Consul drove up and told the soldiers to disarm the Kurds. What was his surprise to find that the traveller was a Turkish prefect. Till security arrived he had concealed his identity, and his protest was now raised, not against robbers, but against the danger of asking Kurds to give up their rifles. The Consul insisted, and the men were taken to Van gaol. Their demand for an early release was granted. Ludicrous as such facts may appear, they indicate a situation which for the Armenian is intolerable.

Only last year a British Consul was himself attacked by Kurds and compelled to fight a miniature battle. The Consul shot straighter than the Kurd, and thus saved his own skin.

To his neighbours the Kurd is no doubt an unmitigated curse. But to the traveller he remains (to borrow a phrase from the well-known work of Lynch) 'a picturesque and welcome presence.' He alone, in those vast

and arid spaces, supplies a touch of colour and romance. I shall never forget how, pursuing our monotonous way, a brilliant apparition suddenly confronted us. It was a young chief and his wife, the man with a rifle across his saddle, the lady, in long yellow jacket and pantaloons of purple velvet, sitting astride a restive horse with erect confidence and ease, the face surmounted by a lofty head-dress which recalled the Canterbury Pilgrims—truly as splendid a couple as this drab modern world can show.

CHAPTER II

TURKISH ARMENIA

Both in mental calibre and in his mode of life the Armenian is a totally different being from his neighbour, the Kurd. It will be my endeavour in this and the following chapter to give some impressions of Armenian character based on personal observations.

One of us has been acquainted with Armenians in India, where they are generally classed among 'Europeans' (Eurasians) and the commercial classes. Anglo-Indians know little of them socially, but they credit them with being as 'smart' in a 'deal' as either Greeks or Jews. Nevertheless, they form a very useful section of the community in India, and there are no more loyal British subjects. Easterns themselves, they comprehend the Oriental mind better than we do; yet they are strangely Western in ideas. It is not generally known to what extent they assisted our occupation of

India, or how great service they rendered to the military as interpreters, guides, and scouts. As expert and pushing traders we know the Armenians in our larger towns. Some of the best teachers of Arabic, Turkish, and Oriental languages in London are also Armenian. Few of us know them at home. Yet those who do are the first to claim that the commercial classes who settle abroad and become cosmopolitan are not to be taken as typical of the nation. Like other nations they have many types; and these are seen to the best advantage in their own country. Anyhow, the Armenian peasant, as we saw him in Turkey and Russia, is a fine stalwart fellow, virile and persistent like his Bulgarian counterpart, with many of the same characteristics, and with an extraordinary love of cultivating the soil. If he is dirty and miserably clad, he is at any rate cleaner than his neighbours, and his home is markedly more tidy.

A reproach often levelled against him is that he is mean and cowardly; and on occasion has been known to fail in manly self-defence. Such stories smack of prejudice. Individuals of any race are liable to moral breakdowns. Armenians have rendered good account of themselves in the Russian army as well as with the Turks. A company of Armenians fought for the

Bulgarians last winter. Their part in the Russian Revolution is also well known. That they are cowardly as a race is a fiction, based on the evidence that unarmed men are unable to defend themselves against modern rifles in the hands of their oppressors. The best type of Armenian, and one not infrequently met in the country, is tall, square, and dark, rather silent, slow and deliberate in speech, and much less greedy of baksheesh than his Moslem neighbour. His sparkling black eyes bespeak resolution and intensity of purpose. A desperate man in an emergency when his honour or that of his nation is at stake, he is made of the metal which produces warriors and fighters like the heroes of Zeitun, in Cilicia, who have never surrendered to the Turkish yoke.

Of another type is the revolutionary leader. A little man with a big head, extraordinarily eloquent and rapid in speech, using much gesture. He cultivates the Bohemian manner and appearance, wears a red tie, and allows his hair to grow long. More often, however, in Turkey he must adopt a disguise; sometimes it is the 'get-up' of a sportsman, at others the retiring manner of an evangelist. So he moves about the country, organising, preaching, instructing the peasants, holding his life in his hands from day to day. That there are numerous pitfalls surrounding

the leader of a revolutionary movement is obvious, and Armenians are not exempt from the temptations of ordinary mortals. In face of official outrages and legalised robbery men are driven to extremes, and to what, under other conditions, would be actually 'crime.' The better the men, in fact, and the deeper their sense of wrong, the more violent they become. The knowledge that no mercy will be granted, that the Government, instead of giving help and protection to its citizens, is prepared to imprison and torture them without trial—this will drive the noblest of men to desperate measures when the moral sense is outraged.

Some of our most pleasant memories are of visits paid to remote monasteries high up on the great central tableland of Asia Minor. In early centuries the monasteries were centres of education, and the monks were apprenticed to various trades such as carpentry and weaving. They were the chief organisers both of industry and of agriculture. Pilgrims flocked to see these convents, not only for devotional purposes, but also to obtain medical treatment, and to learn new methods of cultivating their lands. From the monks, in fact, the people took their ideas and formed their habits of life. The monasteries retain a mere shadow of their former glory, but even now, though their flocks

and herds are gone and the number of their camels and buffaloes is reduced to a minimum, they continue to play a great part in the national scheme, and they are certainly most picturesque features of this wild and desolate country.

Having travelled many days in great heat, over mountainous passes, we clambered up to a precipitous ridge late one afternoon. The sun's heat and glare were a little diminished, and a fine reward was in store for us when we reached the summit. There in the distance, and 2,000 feet below us, but looking much nearer, lay a sheet of glimmering blue water with a fringe of green along the nearest shore. It was Lake Van. Beyond and around the lake arose ridge after ridge of pink and purple mountains. To the right the new fallen snow on Sipan glistened white under the slanting rays, and in the remotest haze one could just catch the light on the peak of Ararat. As we approached the monastery, the abbot himself came out to meet us and hold our hands and embrace us; then he led us up to our quarters, the best rooms in the building, in one of which a beautiful carpet, said to have been four hundred years old, was spread out. All the best of what the monastery could provide was set at our disposal. It was Akhavank, and opposite us, three miles from the shore, was the rocky Island of Aktamar. On the east

side it appeared as a tall cliff, but the ground slopes away and flattens itself out towards the other end. On the level space stands the famous monastery of Aktamar, which for many centuries has been the seat of a Catholicos. The church here is peculiar on account of the rich friezes which adorn its external walls and which give the suggestion of Assyrian or Egyptian architecture. The ordinary Armenian church is not very large, but tall in proportion to its size. It is a square chapel with an apse in each wall, the eastern one containing the altar. Between the apses and in the four corners are deep recesses, which sometimes show on the exterior. The walls are very massive, seven or eight feet in thickness, and the windows very small, making the interior dark and gloomy. Over this chapel is a dome and tower. From a distance one can always distinguish an Armenian church by its polygonal tower and its squat, conical spire. The chapel is often connected by a doorway with an ante-chapel or *pronaos*, and outside this is an elaborate porch surmounted by a bell-tower. The whole effect is strong and pleasing. Among the many churches we visited, none that I remember was a more perfect specimen of the best age of Armenian architecture than the Church of St. Ripsime at Etchmiadzin.

* * * * * *

In the West the labour movement is demanding a greater measure of both personal freedom and personal security as the conditions on which alone true human life can be built up. We are beginning to recognise that any form of personal tyranny or of economic insecurity is liable to undermine strength of character. The uncertainties of industrial life, long periods without work, long periods without a home—are conditions that paralyse the force and will of a man. These conditions, multiplied tenfold, obtain in Armenia. Nothing is more extraordinary to my mind than the way in which the agricultural population has preserved its vitality and *morale* under them, and in spite of periodic eruptions. Take the case of an ordinary Christian peasant in Armenia. Little value is put upon his life. In the eyes of the State he is worth £5 at the most. He never knows when his home may be raided and all his savings carried off. His children may never grow up to inherit the fruit of his labour. He can make no calculations for the future. Yet in the face of this his race survives; he brings up a family; he is able to achieve a considerable measure of personal happiness; he even seeks some measure of culture and intellectual advancement. His point of view is one of persistent optimism, and it is this which

TURKISH ARMENIA : TREADING OUT THE CORN

has saved his race from extinction. He shows an astonishing power of recovery from the worst disasters. He is no fatalist. His point of view seems to be that true life *must* be greater than this half-existence he knows—that there must be better things in store. His enterprising spirit catches at everything which can be turned to his advantage. From a wreck there is always something saved, he believes, out of which to build anew.

This spirit provides, out of very meagre material, a fund of pleasurable things. Such, for instance, was evinced by a simple festival in a remote town near the Persian frontier. Many peasants had come in from the neighbouring villages for the occasion—men, women and children—all in holiday mood and in gala attire. The courtyard of the church resounded with the happy sounds of their merrymaking. Towards evening music started, a flute and a drum forming the orchestra—the weird, nature-music of the Orient, chaotic and passionate to our ears. In the twilight the younger girls began to dance, first three of them in a ring, then one child alone. It was the folk-dance of the country: a series of postures—body movements—not ungraceful, followed one another rapidly. The little girl wore a simple, long white frock, and as she danced a spell fell upon the crowd, who

only moved to widen the space and to give her more freedom. Then the men danced arm in arm, five or six in a row ; and afterwards the party adjourned for supper to a large room near by. Here they all sat on the floor and partook of *pilaf*, *yahout*, tea, fruit, the pancake-like bread of the country, and cheese. The parish priest led us from one group of merrymakers to another. But presently he drew us aside to a quiet corner, and his face changed as he told us the story of murder, outrage, and robbery to which these people were subject. The district happened to be particularly disturbed by roving Kurds at the time. Yet who would have suspected that these merrymakers were treading, as it were, on thin ice, which might give way under their feet at any moment ?

There is a remarkable contrast between the villages of Armenians and the villages of Kurds. We had travelled for days in a Kurdish district, a waste of bare, sandy hills, with never a tree or any sign of cultivation. Our halting-place for lunch proved to be an Armenian village, and luscious melons were put before us which the arid soil produces in abundance as soon as a little irrigation is applied to it. While we sat in the *khan*, the local schoolmaster appeared—a wonder still more remarkable than the melons, for who ever heard of a school in a Kurdish

VARAG MONASTERY

SCHOOLBOYS AT VARAG MONASTERY

village ? We seemed to be suddenly transported to a centre of civilisation. This educational activity is beyond all praise. Here was a man of some ability, prepared to live a lonely life in an isolated village for the sake of his nation and the younger generation. The school system in Armenian villages is entirely voluntary ; there is no Government aid of any kind. The schools are under the general control of the National Committee for Education which sits at Constantinople. The teachers, who are all certificated, are paid by the Committee acting through local agents. Inspectors are also appointed to supervise each district. Those scholars who can pay fees, but poverty is no bar to admission. A certain number of better equipped schools and training colleges are financed by the Union Committee which raises its funds in Egypt and among wealthy Armenians. These are also brought into the national organisation, and the management rests with the National Committee. The teacher is generally single-handed in the villages, but is sometimes assisted in giving the religious instruction by the parish priest.

We visited a Secondary Boys' School attached to an ancient monastic establishment at Varag. The school has had an adventurous career. It was founded by Bishop Mekertich, the pioneer of modern education in Armenia, fifty years

ago. At the time of the massacres[1] masters and boys had to fly to the mountains, and while they were absent the buildings were completely destroyed by fire. Nevertheless, an entire reconstruction was undertaken. The church, which happily was not destroyed, occupies one side of the courtyard and the new buildings occupy the other three; a second courtyard is now nearing completion. A second attempt was made less than three years ago to despoil this institution. The attacking party, about a hundred strong, was repelled by five Armenian revolutionaries, aided no doubt by the 'young blood' of the college. Now there are seventy boys and seven teachers, all laymen. The system is pre-eminently practical. The pupils are destined for teaching, and since it is considered part of a village schoolmaster's duty in Armenia to be able to assist peasants in agricultural matters, thorough instruction is given in fruit, vegetable, and poultry culture, dairy work, and general gardening. The school grounds form a delightful oasis of irrigated lands in the midst of surrounding desert. The school printing press was stolen by Government and the compositor abducted; but a more modern machine has taken its place. Every boy takes his share out of school hours in carpentry

[1] 1909.

and house-work. The courtyard forms a fine playground, and here, having mentioned Boy Scouts, I found myself surrounded by an ardent crowd, thirsting for scout lore, and begging to be enrolled at once as 'tenderfeet.' In the morning, as we rode away, the school was drawn up in two lines, while patriotic songs were sung with great fervour : one song commencing—

'Our Fatherland is helpless,
Crushed by the enemy.'

and another (which was composed by the Young Turks themselves at the Revolution!) beginning —'Down with all tyrants . . .'

* * * * * *

It is necessary now to turn to the more sinister aspect of affairs which is revealed by an enquiry into peasant conditions in the vilayets. It would be idle to deny the difficulties which beset the Government at Constantinople, nor do we disguise the fact that in certain respects progress has been made since the Constitution in the internal affairs of Asiatic Turkey. The difficulties are perennial—mixed populations, religious differences, traditional anarchy. We British have to deal with the same problems in parts of India—restless tribes on the frontiers ; bands of dacoits, ready to take advantage of any slackening on the part of Government. Adequate force is necessary, and above all a

firm hand in order to secure protection for the undefended sections of the community. In Burma (an instance known to me personally), such protection is afforded by military police. But the Turkish Government has, apparently, neither the force nor the firm hand to fulfil its responsibilities. The gendarmerie is weak and undisciplined. Its professed ideas have radically changed, but in actual practice, what does the change amount to ? There is a certain lack of sincerity in these professions. 'The Government takes half measures, but is not sincere'—this is the verdict even of its friends. The Kurds know this only too well, and know how to take advantage of it. In some respects the position is more intolerable now than before the Constitution. The hopes that were then raised have been extinguished by subsequent events. The spread of education and enlightenment makes the yoke heavier and the misery more acute. Grievances seem to arise, in the main, from two sets of factors: (1) Those which are part and parcel of the deliberate policy of the Government; and (2) certain other factors which the Government, with its present personnel, has not the power to check.

(1) Those in the first category are of course the more numerous. There is first the question of massacre. To call this the 'policy' of a

Government sounds something like romancing to modern English ears. Yet it remains true, and I have never heard the statement seriously challenged, that there are no massacres in Turkey except when ordered by the Government. The massacres of 1895–6; the massacre at Van, March 1908; the massacres at Adana and in Cilicia, 1909—have all been by the consent of authority. We sat in a little lodging one evening after supper. Our companions became communicative. They began to recall some of the incidents. The terrors began early in the morning. Some women fled panic-stricken down the street; shots were heard—this was the first warning. Then a crowd of fugitives gathered in the little courtyard, hoping for protection from the British Consulate near by. Our friends already had made up their minds where to go. They slipped out at the back, crossed a narrow passage and gained access to one of those gardens, surrounded by high mud walls, which are attached to almost every house in this quarter of the town. So from one garden to another they hastened, expecting to be overtaken at any moment—while the awful butchery proceeded. They saw many cut down. A group of little boys fled along a lane in the same direction; in a few moments they might have reached safety, when round a corner Turkish

soldiers appeared. The little boys were caught in a trap. In a minute or two, Turkish swords had done their work, and, bloodstained, were seeking further prey. Meanwhile the fugitives were providentially spared, and reached the shelter of the American Mission. Here were gathered some scores of fugitives. The compound and building were a very harbour of refuge. Yet even under American protection life was not secure. During the night, the crowded schoolrooms and outhouses were raided, and soldiers carried off some of the best-favoured both of boys and girls, never to be seen again by their relatives. The horrors of those days have been told before. House after house in the Armenian quarter was ransacked, and every valuable removed, and the buildings committed to the flames. For those who were not butchered in the streets worse tortures were reserved. In some cases horseshoes were riveted on to men's feet; wild cats were attached to the bare bodies of men and of women so that they might tear the flesh with their claws; many were soaked in oil and burnt alive in the streets.

With such memories in the minds of all, can we wonder that the position of the Armenians should be described as intolerable? Can we wonder that a stream of refugees continually

crosses the Russian frontier? At a frontier post[1] we were told that more than seven thousand Armenian emigrants had arrived since January of this year. After massacres, the usual course is for Kurds to occupy Armenian lands, and refugees who attempt to return seldom have their claims made good. Only a few months ago such a case occurred at Arjush. An Armenian peasant appealed to the Court for the recovery of his stolen lands. His appeal was granted, and the land ordered to be restored to him as his rightful property. A few days later he and all his family were murdered, and (as usual) no arrests were made.

More clearly still is it the policy of the Government to impoverish the peasantry by taxation. New taxes have recently been imposed. The Christian population suffers from various disabilities, which although not known to civil law are sanctioned by the Sheri, or sacred law of Islam. The non-admission of Christian evidence in certain spheres of law is a case in point. Again, there is the question of carrying arms. According to the civil law, as in other countries, no private citizen may bear arms without paying the necessary fee for a licence. But in practice this law is in abeyance. Practice is governed by immemorial custom. By the

[1] October 1913.

sacred law of custom Kurds may evade the secular law. From time immemorial they have been free to possess arms. Therefore, they may do so to-day. This question of the possession of arms is vital in a country like Asiatic Turkey. As our coachman said, 'Without a rifle you are as a woman.' The Government does not protect you; you must protect yourself or go under. This is exactly what the Dashnakists[1] are now demanding. It is seen to be the crux of the whole question. To meet force with force, and so to neutralise force, is the first thing to be done. Either disarm all or arm all citizens; only so will there be equality. Once that is done Christians and Kurds may unite to demand their civil rights. But there will be no improvement, no peace, no security, no future for the country, until this elementary justice be done. The Government knows it well enough. And now, under threat of the interference of the Powers, it professes to set the matter right. Five hundred rifles have been distributed to Armenian villagers. This does not imply that the normal policy of arming the Kurds has ceased.

(2) In regard to the second class of grievances, disorders, insecurity of the roads, failure of justice, and so on, these things are in part at

[1] The more 'advanced' party among Armenians. See pp. 62 and 63.

THE CHIEF'S WIFE

least beyond the control of the Central Government constituted as it is. Disorders continue at this very moment, and the boasted 'security' and 'tranquillity' of the country exist only in the imagination of biassed politicians, and of travellers who do not look below the surface.

We were witnesses one day of the following scene. A Kurd (armed) was stopped by several Armenians (unarmed) who demanded payment for some grain which had been taken several weeks previously. The Kurd admitted the debt and said he would pay later on. In view of local conditions this meant as much or as little as he liked it to mean. It was no compensation for poor men. They became more insistent. We had two *zaptiehs* with us who immediately took the side of the Kurd and, kicking their heels into their horses' sides, charged the peasants. The latter stood their ground, seizing the horses by the bridles. Thereupon, one *zaptieh* drew out a long leather whip with which he heartily belaboured these 'insolent Christians.' The other *zaptieh* used the butt of his rifle and drove them back while the Kurd made good his escape. 'What are we coming to,' they said, 'when Christians dare to argue? This province is ruined.'

The following adventure was reported by a Russian Consul. Travelling one day with his

escort he came upon a caravan being held up and robbed by Kurdish brigands. To his surprise he recognised the Kaimakam of the district looking on at the scene without making any protest. He demanded instantly that the brigands should be arrested and disarmed. The Kaimakam demurred, saying it was 'quite impossible' to interfere with Kurds. The Consul then ordered his own escort to make the arrest. Two were captured and three others escaped. The two men were afterwards brought to trial, but acquitted. Indeed, this is generally the result of a trial where Kurds are concerned. Gendarmes driven out of Macedonia since the Balkan war and sent to various towns of Armenia to preserve order have been a source of constant trouble and provocation. Two of these shot dead an Armenian dentist in a crowded street at Van just before we arrived, and then attempted to arrest some Armenians as the murderers. After this incident the Armenians of the place closed the market and stopped all work. They demanded either the removal of these gendarmes or the enlistment of Armenians in the police force.

Finally, this country, once fertile and well peopled, remains a desert. No progress is possible, for not even superhuman effort can face the obstacles and disasters which Turkish

'Government' implies. Yet the fertility of the soil under irrigation is obvious to any one who takes the trouble to investigate what has been done already by Armenians, and in spite of enormous difficulties. This negative grievance, due to the Turk's fatal inability to govern, by which the natural spontaneous development of a whole people's culture is arrested and paralysed, is a scandal to Europe. So long as the Turk remains what he has always been, so long will his conquests and his continued domination remain a curse and a blight upon the face of the globe. He has had his chance and has lamentably failed to use it. Geographically, what more favourable situation could be found for a capital than Constantinople? The Turk inherited the riches and the culture of the Byzantine Empire; and what has he done with them? No province in Asia is now poorer, more ignorant, or more lawless. Let it be granted that the *status quo* demands an autocratic rule, based on adequate force, which shall deal out impartial justice and give an equal chance to all. But the Turk cannot provide it. He remains a barbarian with the power to be brutal and without the power to govern.

As you sit and talk with the Young Turk official in his luxurious house, as his pretty children bring you toys and sweets, you feel

a subtle charm about these men. They have modern ideas. They dispense with conventional terms of flattery. They are horrified at tales of barbarity and anarchy, and like to discuss the need of 'reforms.' But after all these 'reforms' never come. Patience is coming to an end, however, and Armenian parties are now united in the conclusion that armed resistance is necessary, if any betterment is to be gained. The policy of 'self-defence,' however, is rather of the nature of a temporary expedient than of a solution of the problem. Real reforms are essential if disorders are to be averted in the future. The urgency of the problem is only realised on the spot, when in talking either to the peasants in the villages or to the leading men of the organised parties, one hears the new attitude. There is no more faith in 'reforms from within.' The demand is for executive control by the Powers. This would be the best solution. It need not involve the breaking up of Turkey. The fundamental point is that the governor or governing council should be responsible to the Powers alone, and should look to the Sublime Porte neither for appointment nor for tenure of office. Should the Armenians be led to despair of such control there is only one other alternative. Wherever we went we found them turning with new eagerness and

fervour to the Russian solution. There is always before them the contrast of Russian with Turkish Armenia. They know that Russia provides order, security, and elementary justice. And so the villagers would be glad, should Russian troops again occupy the tableland of Armenia. Russia waits her opportunity. Who will stand in her way when the opportunity comes ?

CHAPTER III

RUSSIAN ARMENIA

We had travelled two days and nights in a crowded train from Moscow. As far as Rostoff on the Don there was nothing to look at but a monotonous plain or prairie, with here and there little townships newly laid out in broad, straight streets. After Rostoff the country becomes more interesting by reason of the variety of faces and costumes one sees on the railway platforms. The nearer one travels to the Caucasus, the greater the variety.

It is all very new and raw looking. The restaurants present the liveliest scene during the few minutes allowed us by the train. The fairest of Russians, with their straight yellow hair, jostle with Turkomans and Tartars of the darkest hue, in the general scramble for food and drink.

It is a veritable jumble of Europe and Asia, a medley of the latest 'civilisation' with the manners and customs of barbarism. There is

RUSSIAN GUARD AT VLADIKAVKAS

the ' ikon ' in the booking-hall towards which orthodox Russians bow with the deepest reverence, in spite of their hurry for lunch. Inside, one sits down next an Austrian professor who talks archæology and agnosticism in perfect English.

A little farther down the table is a burly Tartar, a dagger slung across his belt, eating meat and chicken with his fingers. We are all going the same way, and we are united by the jolly sense of travel and leisure and mutual interest in one another.

At Minerali, a health resort where Caucasian ' Society ' drinks the waters and ' does nothing ' gracefully, we have to tumble out. It is a primitive raw town, like many others in Southern Russia, with no attractions for us. We are glad to set off again, after only an hour's halt, on the way to Vladikavkas.

The plain or ' steppe,' as the Russians call it, is here more fertile and undulating. The soil, quite black, grows fields of maize and sun-flowers, the seed of which is a favourite food. There are broad cart-tracks here and there, but no roads and very few villages. Stacks of straw are dotted about, and indicate a population which is not much in evidence.

It was on an evening early in September that we reached Vladikavkas, the end of the branch line from Minerali, at the foot of the northern

slopes of the Caucasus. A brilliant moon, plus the genial company of an officer returning to his regiment at Tiflis, induced us to make a start for the Dariel Pass without delay. The Dariel road is one of the greatest public works that the Russians have achieved in this province. It is 130 miles long, and cost four million pounds to construct.

Along its higher levels, in the Pass itself, one gets the wildest, grandest scenery. The finest sight is the peak of Kasbek rising to 16,500 feet, the Matterhorn of the Caucasus. The traveller is overawed by these gorges, incredibly wild and stern, with their vast masses of towering rocks and crags such as are, I suppose, unrivalled in any other peak ranges of the world. At the narrowest and most precipitous passage (the actual gorge, in all probability, described by Strabo, Tacitus, and Pliny as the 'Caucasian Gates') the rocks rise almost straight up to a height of 8,000 feet above the road. Next day our motor brought us to Tiflis.

The Russian province of the Caucasus must not be regarded as a part of Russia proper. It rather corresponds to an Asiatic dependency, to which some sort of outward unity is given by the Russian occupation, but which is really a 'museum' of sixty or seventy different races and tribes. Chief of these are Armenians, Georgians, Tartars, Lesgians, and Persians.

These many different peoples would, no doubt, be at constant war among themselves, if it were not for some one strong and impartial power over them all. What the Russians have effected here during the last century has been an achievement of no small proportions. Whatever losses may have accrued to the stronger peoples, whose nature is to oppress weaker nationalities, it may well be argued that the common good is best served by an impartial justice, which maintains a general peace and largely increases personal security and the happiness of the individual.

Through the peace thus assured population has grown, the land has been developed (chiefly by the enterprise of Armenians), prosperous towns and villages have sprung into being. On these grounds we justify our British 'Raj' in India, which without our rule would be plunged in anarchy and civil strife.

I have said that a 'general' peace is secured under Russian government. This does not mean that brigandage has been stopped. Travelling is not without its risks, even on the railway. The number of cases of highway robbery in the Caucasus during the year 1912 amounted to 8,350. Martial law is retained in several districts. Ever since 1859, when the Lesgian chief, Shamyl, surrendered to a Russian force,

under Prince Bariatinski, there have been robber chiefs who have rivalled his reputation.

According to a fairly common report these brigands are sometimes high-minded and chivalrous men, who only rob the rich in order to give the spoils to the poor. How far this is true I will not commit myself to say, but if one believed all the tales told one would be obliged to credit them with almost supernatural powers if not supernatural virtues.

One chief had the power to disappear, and reappear simultaneously at some distant spot in the mountains. Another, Selim by name, has been credited with a charmed life, for he jumped a precipice of 100 feet and took no hurt. This man was captured in Daghestan last October.[1] For years he had terrorised the villages and scattered populations. The Russians at last decided that his exploits were becoming unseemly, and a reproach to decent government. How to catch him was the problem. He had many times escaped. At last a plan was hit upon. Some of Selim's relatives were already in the hands of the police. These were brought into the district, in the hope that he would be enticed to visit them. Selim unwarily took the bait, and was surrounded. Being mortally wounded he fought on desperately, and so good

[1] 1913.

was his shooting that he killed three of them before a whole company of Cossacks could close with him.

The present Viceroy of the Caucasus, Prince Vorontsov-Dashkov, published a report in August (1913) upon the general condition of the province which appeared in a *Times' Supplement* on Russia. He claims that the many racial and religious differences which exist do not prevent the population from living and working harmoniously together as Russian citizens. The Viceroy's own liberal and large-minded policy is to be credited with this happy result.

Russian rule may not be so impartial as British rule in India, but on other scores it is superior. As Mr. (now, Lord) Bryce pointed out more than thirty years ago, Russian officials have none of that coldness and hauteur towards 'natives' which our civil servants are inclined to show to the races under their rule. Partly apathy and partly good-nature in the Russian enables him to mix with his Asiatic subjects on terms of social equality.[1]

Taking the whole province, the Moslem population is numerically preponderant, and is the more liable to fanaticism owing to the vicinity of the great Moslem States of the Sultan and the Shah. Yet, in spite of these

[1] See Bryce, *Transcaucasia and Ararat*, p. 119.

facts, the preaching of Pan-Islamism has been of no avail—Tartars, Persians, and the rest all remain contented subjects of Russia.

Of the numerous questions of interest, which a journey into the Caucasus tempts one to study, one is bound to select one or at most two for special consideration. What I have now to say about the Caucasus chiefly concerns the Armenian community.

* * * * * *

Naturally, one begins at Tiflis, where one arrives after the journey along the Dariel road from Vladikavkas. Tiflis is now brought within six days' journey of London. Instead of entering an Asiatic town, you approach the city through miles of well-paved streets, and, as you enter the Galavinsky Prospect, you might well imagine yourself in a modern city of the West. Tiflis is best known as the ancient capital of the Georgian kingdom, but to-day it is as much the capital of the Armenians as of any other race, for it has been the Armenians who have built up this modern city, and who at present have the larger share in its control and administration.

The policy of the present Viceroy towards the Armenians has been in direct contrast to that of his predecessor. Their Church property has been restored to them in full, their schools

ARMENIAN PEASANT GIRL IN THE CAUCASUS

are in no way restricted, and there is ample freedom in the use of their own language.

In education, the Armenians are specially ambitious. The Seminary, containing 600 students, has just moved into a new building on the outskirts of Tiflis. This College is admirably equipped; every master must have a University degree; yet it receives no Government grants-in-aid, and owes its foundation to the munificence of rich Armenians only.

The Russian Senator, an official second only to the Viceroy, warmly praised the enterprise and public spirit which has built up and maintains such an institution. The Russian Government puts no restrictions on the course of instruction; of this we had good evidence when we found large maps on the walls of each lecture room showing the boundaries of the former Armenian kingdom.

Among the Armenians there is a strong opinion in favour of a University for the Caucasus. At present those students who want degrees are obliged to go either to St. Petersburg or to a foreign University. Many go to German Universities, in several of which hostels have been established for the assistance and accommodation of Armenian students.

The Seminary at Tiflis is not the only Lycée maintained in the Caucasus by Armenians.

There is also the Academy at Etchmiadzin, whose educational standards are almost as high as those of the Seminary. Both of these institutions have a number of studentships, supported by rich Armenians, by means of which many of the more intelligent young men, however poor they may be, gain access to higher culture.

An Armenian lady in Tiflis has lately established a model school, where young children —Russian, French and German, as well as Armenian—have the advantages of scientific training. Here, in the kindergarten section, Montessori methods are in use.

Among the educational institutions of Tiflis, special mention should be made of 'the people's palace,' which is a theatre, a library and a club, all combined in one building. It is run at a loss by rich patriots, for the sake of the national cause. The spirit which animates these wealthy men is also shared by artists, for we met an actor, a man who has played on the best stages in Paris, who has more than once given his services at the people's theatre free, in order to secure the production of good Armenian plays.

We visited this popular theatre one evening. For a merely nominal sum one may take the best seats, and the building was consequently

packed with Armenians, many of the poorest class, who followed intelligently a modern life play, in which a money-lender is represented as exploiting the villagers.

In the larger theatres, the best of which is under Armenian management, Russian plays are often produced. An Armenian justified this to us, not only on the ground that Russian is the official language common to all educated people, but ' because Russian culture is so good.' Bernard Shaw's and other foreign plays are generally produced in Russian, sometimes in French.

Another social invention of Tiflis is the garden club. This corresponds more or less to the Gymkhana Club of India, except that it is also a place for dinner or late supper. When afternoon tea is at 7, dinner is not before 10 P.M., and the world retires to bed at midnight, and often much later. These clubs on summer evenings are crowded, Russians mixing freely with Armenians. This freedom of social intercourse between the governing race and the governed is significant. It indicates an approximate level of culture on both sides, and a meritorious absence of pride on the part of Russian officialdom.

As to the Armenian press in Tiflis, the best known dailies are the *Horizon* and the *Mcshak*. The former represents advanced

opinion, and is inspired by the Dashnakist party; the latter is associated with the views of the Ramkavarists. A word must be said here as to political and nationalist opinions held by Armenians.

Opinion is broadly divided into three parties, or rather societies, the societies respectively of the *Dashnak*, *Hunchak*, and *Ramkavar*. This division applies equally to Russia and Turkey, although, naturally, both their importance and their activity are greatest in Turkey. The views of these nationalist societies fluctuate according to the policy of Government towards the civil rights and national aspirations of the Armenian people.

Whenever the Government is liberal and conciliatory, the societies become milder, modifying their criticism with changing conditions. This was seen, in particular, at the time of the Turkish revolution, when the Dashnakists, notoriously the most advanced section of the nationalists, joined hands as comrades with the Young Turks, and endeavoured to work with them until reaction set in, and the Adana massacre made further alliance impossible. When the Government becomes harsh and repressive, on the other hand, the nationalist societies become openly revolutionary, as is the case now in Turkey, where the movement of

protest is more serious than ever it has been in previous years.

It must be understood, of course, that these societies are nationalist, rather than 'revolutionary' in the ordinary sense. At the same time, when the nationalist cause is not in danger, and there is less need for agitation, these societies are ready to establish relations with the Russian parties of democracy. Thus one may draw comparisons, although not very close ones, between the Dashnakists and the Russian Revolutionists; between the Hunchakists and the Russian Socialists or Social Democrats; between the Ramkavarists and the Russian Liberals or Cadets. In 1905, at the time of the Russian Revolution, for example, many Armenians were arrested and exiled, not for being nationalist, but for having joined Russian revolutionary societies. Such a thing could not happen in Turkey, where revolutionary opinion is always nationalist, and there are no 'class' movements.

The Armenian parties are ably represented by their press. The two daily journals which have been mentioned are well edited; foreign news is fully reported through the Central Agency; and the pages include columns dealing with history, literature, and general subjects. There is no lack of criticism of Armenian institutions; the Church, the professions, the

schools, the parties all come in for their full share of it.

There is also an illustrated press, and several literary and philosophical journals. A monthly paper, dealing with archæology, music, art, poetry, and drama, deserves special merit for its beautiful reproductions and good taste.

The Armenian is not, as a rule, able to get much sympathy from English travellers. He is not a sportsman, and he is apt to cringe—an unpardonable offence, and one that quickly puts a stop to further intercourse. Moreover, he looks rather fat and flabby ; and his Semitic features and heavy gold watch-chain do not add charm to the general impression. I must confess I went to Armenia considerably prejudiced myself, and it was only after the surprises and discoveries of my journey that I came to revise my former opinion, and to think that the real cause of jealousy of the Armenian is his success.

As soon as one begins to look at the problem as a whole, various aspects of it, disregarded previously, come into view. To begin with, one finds that not all Armenians are successful usurers, or even men of business. By far the larger part of them are peasants, living the simplest of country lives, and content with very little in the way of material luxuries. In fact, they are really an agricultural race, and not a

commercial one at all. In Turkey there are two millions of them, practically all agriculturists. In Russia over a million cultivate the soil. The Government helps them by starting model farms and gardens, and by experimenting in forestry. To see Armenian peasants at their best, one should make a tour among the villages near Erivan, north and east of Mount Ararat. One should stay in their homes, join in their festivals, and so come to learn their folk-lore.

The valley of the Araxes, which circles Ararat, and was described of old by Herodotus, is the heart of Russian Armenia. It is a huge alluvial plain, Asiatic in its general aspect, growing cotton, rice, and tobacco in little fields, divided from one another by mud banks. The atmosphere in summer is as dry as possible, the soil parched and cracked, and deep with the finest dust. The annual rainfall is not more than about twelve inches.

We made a tour in this country, driving from village to village. The plain, which would be arid waste without irrigation, has here come to look like the rich plains of Lombardy. As one drives out of a village, there are high mud walls on either side, denoting carefully tended orchards of mulberries or peaches.

It is a vast community of market gardeners. The peasants are, for the most part, small

proprietors who cultivate as much as they can manage themselves without employing extra labour. They appear to live a simple life with a very fair amount of comfort. Extreme poverty is not unknown, however, and in the larger villages and towns like Erivan one sees Armenian beggars, and a good deal of destitution which is due to the influx of immigrants from Turkey. It is difficult to find work for them in a country where there is no great demand for wage-labour. The Armenians of these villages, however, led by their priests and schoolmasters, organise committees of relief, and act as agencies for employment as far as they can.

* * * * * *

When one compares Russian Armenia with the state of things just over the frontier one meets an amazing contrast. To anyone going there for the first time the condition of Turkish Armenia is a perfect revelation of tyranny, stupidity, and crime. It appears to be equally bad for everybody. The country is destitute and neglected.

One asks, What have the Turks been doing this 600 years ? There is not a trace of any constructive effort. Naturally, the soil is rich and productive, but nothing is done to develop it. In the general desolation Turks and Kurds suffer as well as Armenians. Kurds and even

ERIVAN, A RUSSIANISED TOWN

Turks are driven to emigrate to America to get a chance to live a decent human life.

All the while Government demands money, money. Taxes are 'farmed out' to feudal chiefs, officials, or to Turkish beys; an atrocious system, lending itself to every kind of corruption, but one that successfully squeezes all the available wealth out of the pockets of the peasantry. Where all this money goes to, one knows only too well.

None of it comes back to help the people. No roads are made, no public works of any kind. The Armenians are the only people with constructive ideas, but they are allowed no influence whatever. They are obliged to hide their wealth, if they have any. It is amazing how, in spite of the risks, they have been able to start schools everywhere, entirely by voluntary sacrifices among themselves.

In Turkey, then, the problem is one of elementary justice to the individual, the right to live, and the claim of one citizen to equal rights with his neighbours. Armenian socialism is strong, but is demanding only what the workers in the West have had already for centuries.

In Russia, it is rather a question of nationality. Here is a small nation, which, although for centuries without political independence or freedom, has continued to exist and assert itself

as something individual, peculiar, distinct. If nations have souls, and a particular message or idea to give to the world, then has not each nation a right to respect and regard, similar to the admitted right of the individual ?

What *are* the claims of nationality ? Is it a force stimulating men to make the best of themselves ? If so, can we allow it to be suppressed ? Does not the world lose something by its absorption into a larger unity ? Will these race-conflicts continue for ever ? How will Russia solve the problem in her growing Empire ?

As I have said above, the policy of the present Viceroy is to conciliate rather than to repress, and this policy is likely to be continued in the future. The Russians, unable to colonise this province themselves, are wise enough to allow Armenians and others to do it for them. Considerable liberties have been granted to the Armenians, who, although they are ready enough to criticise Government, have now no separatist movement among them.

In fact, all ideas of political independence are given up, for they are coming to see that the *real* things of importance to national life may be preserved without it. So long as their language, religion, and schools are respected, they will be very content to remain subjects of the Russian Empire.

CHAPTER IV

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH

Etchmiadzin, in the Russian Caucasus, is the Mother Throne of the Church of Armenia. Its surroundings are purely Asiatic. From the railway-station you drive for miles across a sun-baked plain, where lazy buffalo wallow in the water-holes to find relief from flies and heat, and where camels with surly resentment follow the beaten track, or meander at their own sweet will. There are no trees visible. The sun beats fiercely on the road, the continuity of which is only broken here and there by little clouds of dust, each of which betokens a bullock-cart or perhaps phaeton, making its way at crawling pace towards the horizon.

One vision there is, however, which is cooling to the traveller on a summer's day. It is the snowy peak of Mount Ararat, which lies to the south, standing up very pure and noble against a cloudless sky. And as one proceeds, another object, equally welcome, comes into view.

This is a patch of irrigated land, and with it the sight of green trees. It proves that one is nearing the Abbey lands. Sooner than expected, one comes to Lombardy poplars, vineyards, and melon-fields, and then into an untidy village street. Here the horses break into a trot, feeling near their journey's end, and after a few minutes one swings round a corner and up to a gateway, alongside the great crumbling walls of the monastery.

At the guest-house we were hospitably entertained, and regaled with local wine and fruit. After this refreshment we passed through the mud walls to the inner courts, built largely in quite recent years of the black stone peculiar to this region. In the centre of the large quadrangle stands the Cathedral of the Blessed Virgin on the spot most holy to Armenians, where St. Gregory received the vision of 'Etchmiadzin' ('The Son of God come down') and where, in A.D. 303, he built a tiny chapel. Gregory's chapel is still there to-day. It has been preserved throughout the centuries, like the Portiuncula of St. Francis at Assisi, by the sheltering walls of the church. In the dim religious light, the great dome seems to brood over the hallowed stones of this little shrine. Within it, the Catholicos, the head of the Armenian Church and Nation, is consecrated

ARMENIAN CHURCH IN RUSSIA

MONASTERY AT ETCHMIADZIN

and enthroned. Its canopy form has become the type of those peculiar porches which one finds almost everywhere attached to the Armenian churches.

The Armenian kingdom established Christianity as a State religion some years before Constantine did so in the Eastern Empire. This is how it came about. The Emperor Diocletian (A.D. 282–305) sought for a beautiful girl to be his bride. A Roman maiden, Ripsime, by virtue of surpassing charms, was selected as the most suitable candidate—but being a Christian and a nun she at once refused the proposal of the Emperor. She fled with her companions, and eventually after many wanderings she reached Armenia. Here the Armenian king Tiridates sought to take her for himself. She was brought to the palace, but in an interview refused to surrender her faith or to break her vows by marriage with a heathen king—and resisting by force, she finally threw him down upon the floor and broke his diadem in pieces. He then ordered her to be put to death with all her companions. Soon afterwards, seized with remorse and an intense melancholia, the king betook himself to the woods, leaving his court and his kingly functions. His nobles tried in vain to induce him to return. At length they advised him to try a spiritual teacher whom he had once

despised and persecuted. Gregory, already fifteen years imprisoned for professing Christ's faith, was released from his pit, and the impassioned preaching of 'The Illuminator' resulted in the conversion of Tiridates, who decreed that henceforth Christianity should become the official religion of his people.

The library of the monastery is a treasure-house which contains about four thousand manuscript volumes, mostly Armenian versions and translations (fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries) of Greek and Syriac patristic literature. Our friends showed us with special pride a tenth-century MS. of the Gospels, bound in ivory covers. Mr. F. C. Conybeare, of Oxford, has given fame to this MS. During his visit to Etchmiadzin, now more than twenty years ago, he detected a note of the scribe in the margin which attributes the Appendix to St. Mark's Gospel (Mark xvi. 9–end) to Ariston, mentioned by Papias as one of Christ's disciples.[1] The last twelve verses of St. Mark have been generally regarded as added by another hand; and they do not appear to have been read publicly in the Armenian Church before the tenth century. Since the seventeenth century Etchmiadzin has been an important centre for education, and its greatest institution at the present day is

[1] Quoted *Eusebius*, H. E. iii. 39.

the Academy. The Academy, or University College, was founded through the initiative and enterprise of Catholicos George IV., in 1874, and among Armenian schools has no rival but the Seminary at Tiflis. It is under the special care of the Catholicos. Being near the frontier, many students come here from Turkey and return there after a course of three or five years. Others are transferred direct to Universities in Russia or abroad.

During our visit to Etchmiadzin an interview was arranged for us with the Catholicos. The Catholicos, or Chief Patriarch, is the recognised head of all the Armenians, for the Catholicosate of Sis (in Cilicia), which had been set up having independent authority after Armenia proper had been finally conquered and Etchmiadzin made subject to the orders and whims of foreign rulers, and which for some time claimed to be a rival, has long been reconciled to the chief Patriarchate. When a vacancy for this great office occurs, the whole people (through their representatives in each diocese) elect two candidates. These two candidates are then presented to the Czar, with whom, according to the 'Polojenje' (Constitution of the Armenian Church in Russia, 1856), rests the final choice. The present Catholicos is an old man, simple and dignified. George V., Surenian, as he is

named, was elected by the nation on December 24, 1911. He is the 127th Catholicos in direct succession from St. Gregory, the Illuminator. His residence, the Vatican of the Armenian Church, is one of the picturesque old buildings in the courtyard directly facing the Cathedral. He received us with great courtesy in his private apartment. Wearing his black cowl he was distinguished from other monks and bishops only by the diamond cross over his forehead, and by the Order recently given him by the Czar. We conversed through an interpreter. He spoke much of religious education, and of the spiritual needs of his people. He hopes to extend and improve the church schools in the province, and has just opened a national fund for this purpose, in connection with the recent celebrations in honour of St. Sahak and of St. Mesrop. The Catholicos has lately formed a committee with its centre in Paris and sub-committees in all important capitals of Europe, giving them the mission of working for the execution of reforms in Turkish Armenia,—reforms which were undertaken in the 61st Article of the Berlin Treaty, and supplemented by the Scheme of Reforms promulgated in 1895 by Sultan Abdul Hamid. Both of these solemn engagements by Turkey have remained a dead letter to this day. This conversation recalled some

of the incidents that occurred in the Caucasus during 1903, when jealousy of the wealth and independence of the Armenian Church led to an attempt by the Russian Government to despoil it. An excuse was made that this wealth was being used for revolutionary purposes. The Viceroy Galitzin found in this his opportunity; and a body of troops was despatched to Etchmiadzin. As they approached the holy places, an immense crowd of Armenian peasants collected from the neighbouring villages and followed them threateningly. Stones were thrown. The Catholicos sanctioned a policy of passive resistance, and himself declined to leave his residence. Russian officers arrived and demanded the key of the treasury, and when this was refused the troops broke into the Cathedral and treasury, and carried away both coin and plate. They also occupied the farms and lands of the monastery. Meanwhile, all over the country, Church property was confiscated. All Armenian Churches were closed. No services could be held. The Russians then attempted to bribe both clergy and school teachers. Double salaries were offered to those who would become Orthodox. Not a man, however, accepted the bribe. This 'impasse' lasted for about a year. Then another Viceroy, the present one, arrived, and the official policy was changed. Coercion

gave place to a generous measure of liberation. The property taken was restored in full. The Armenian Church became 'free.' The Armenians gained a moral victory.

What is the real condition of the Armenian Church to-day? This question I shall try and answer in the following pages.

Many of us are accustomed to regard the Eastern Churches as interesting survivals of the primitive days of Christianity, bodies which preserve certain original forms of Christian worship, but whose ritual is obscured by pagan and superstitious accretions, and whose moral influence is hardly existent. An English traveller visits a Nestorian Church in Syria, or a Coptic Church in Cairo. He finds it dirty and irreverent, the liturgy is 'mumbled behind a screen,' as he says, while the congregation is unable to see or hear what is going on. If he reflects further, he thinks perhaps what a pale and spiritless Christ is the object of all this 'mumbling.' 'Bleeding, anguished, dying, a sufferer, so they always shewed Him—a conqueror never.'[1] The Armenian Church is looked upon as equally antiquated and ineffective as the rest.

To the mind of the average Englishman the hoard of ancient customs and survivals,

[1] Vide *The Soul of a Turk*, by V. de Bunsen, p. 77. [John Lane.]

found in an Oriental Church, is pitiably 'superstitious.' The candle grease and the dirty vestments offend his sense of 'decency.' Still more 'obnoxious' are the customs he finds in these Churches of kneeling on the bare, unswept floor, of kissing a cross, of drinking the holy water from a stoop. A little imagination will see how dear and sacred these things become which have grown up and clustered round a religion and its worship. Granted, they have their abuses; but not to see that they have a genuine significance, to be utterly hardened to the sentiments which they enshrine—this is unpardonable. For these things are the outward clothing, so to speak, of deep underlying beliefs, beliefs which are vital, beliefs which endure, and which have sustained thousands of Armenians in their steadfastness to their dear faith, and made them prefer death to abjuring it during, for instance, the massacres of 1894–5.

There are pagan survivals, of course, such as that which I witnessed in one of the lonely monasteries of Turkish Armenia. I was anxious to be up in time for the Liturgy which began about 5 A.M. When I emerged from our quarters the courtyard presented an alarming spectacle. In the half-light I could dimly discern the stains of blood on the pavement. Hurrying forward, I was reassured by the face of the abbot, who was about to enter the church, and

began to explain as best he could the nature of the slaughter which had taken place an hour earlier. Five goats and a sheep had been killed just outside the church porch, and the refuse remained strewn on the ground; the meat was already on the fire in huge iron pots. This sacrifice is called the *matagh*. On occasions of special need, danger or sickness, an Armenian resorts to this peculiar form of 'invocation.' He presents an offering of some living animal at the sanctuary of the Saint from whom he desires a healing or special favour; not indeed in the pagan sense as an offering for the gratification of the Saint, but as an exercise of charity 'which covereth a multitude of sins' and draws the favour of Heaven on the charitable. The village priest is asked to preside at the slaughter of the animal, after which its flesh is immediately cooked and distributed among the most poor and needy of the parish. Later, in the morning, a large number of peasants gathered in the courtyard to receive their share of the sacrifice.

It may be true that the Oriental Churches are largely out of touch with Western ideas, and obscurantist as regards modern science and philosophy. And such criticisms as those just referred to must be met in the world to-day, when Christendom is on its trial. First of all

I would say that they are generally made without recollection of the past conditions under which these Churches have lived and developed. The more one learns of their history, the more one comes to wonder that they have survived at all. They are the smallest Churches of Christendom; for centuries they have been the poorest and least influential. Moreover, they have borne the brunt of persecution. The number of martyrdoms are beyond reckoning. For a thousand years and more their life has been a mere struggle for existence, face to face with, and under the heel of, great Mohammedan States. Even if Christian 'serfs' in these lands are as ignorant and as superstitious as their Moslem landlords, has one any right to condemn them?

External conditions have done much to mould both the inner spirit and the outward form of the Eastern Churches. In Asia these conditions do not rapidly change. Nomad tribes still move restlessly, just as in the days of Abraham, seeking fresh pastures. Physical life is precarious. Physical force is, for common people, and above all for despised Christians, the only law. Christian communities can only defend themselves by tribal or national organisation. For them there is hardly any distinction between their nation as a body organised for

defence, and as a body organised for religion. This is witnessed by the fact that the Patriarch of the Nestorian Church, Mar Shimun, is even to-day a kind of tribal chief or sheikh, his office being hereditary, and he has armed men under his command.

* * * * * *

It is the continuance of these external conditions down to the present time which accounts for the distinctively national character of the lesser Oriental Churches. This is the first of the three most important features of the Armenian Church to which I would call attention. Take for example the place which his national Church holds in the mind of the average Armenian. Just because he has no country he can call his own, no square foot of soil that is not subject to an alien race, he clings all the more passionately to the independence of his Church; and just because, for his race, political unity is now out of the question, ecclesiastical unity is of the most vital moment. It is the one stable institution which binds Armenians all over the world by the closest and dearest ties.

The idea of a national Church, then, was first called forth by political exigencies. But it was based also on a definite ideal and conception of what a united Christendom might be, the

theory of a family of Churches, linked by a common creed, and by intercommunion, &c., yet retaining a real independence both in ritual, organisation, and even in theological expressions. Holding this ideal, the Armenian Church has opposed any proposals for union, either with the Greek or with the Latin Church, just because such union would have meant, actually, unconditional surrender, on terms made by the other party. She has opposed both the domination of Rome and the proselytism of Constantinople. In modern times, union with the Orthodox Church would have assured to Armenians Russian protection both in Turkey and Persia. From that point of view there must have been some temptation in the proposal. But the Armenian Church has held on, consistently, to her own ideal—the ideal of unity without uniformity—the ideal of the One Visible Church, with liberty for each local or national Church within the limits of her own sphere.

It is worth while to compare this theory with the theories held by other Churches. The national idea in religion is rejected both by the Roman Catholic and by the non-Episcopal Churches. The Roman Catholic is in theory, and generally in practice,[1] universalist and

[1] But compare the Roman Catholic Church in Poland and Ireland.

anti-nationalist. It demands uniformity in worship and obedience to one central authority. The non-Episcopal Churches are, for the most part, 'spiritual' or evangelical communities, having still less to do with locality or nationality. It seems more natural to compare the Armenian theory with that of the Anglican Church, which also holds as its ideal of Christendom a family of national Churches, on terms of communion with one another, yet with certain freedom in matters of polity, of worship, and of doctrinal definitions.

Such a relation as that in which the Armenian Church stands towards the nation involves some important consequences for religion. Although there have been gains enough to justify it, yet none the less the losses are real. The Church has never been guilty of persecution. She has never been controlled, either by a monarchy or by an ecclesiastical clique. She is one with the nation. She is an established Church, in the highest sense, yet without an 'establishment.' At the same time religious and national ideals have intermingled—so much so as to become indistinguishable one from another. And the result has been that religious ideals have suffered. They have been secularised to suit the ideals of a nation. The ideal of a divine Commonwealth, in which *all* God's people are to share, has not been strong enough to inspire missionary

zeal among the Armenians ; although it must be remembered, to the honour of the Armenian Church, that not many years after the Armenian nation had been converted to Christianity, Bishop Gregoris and Bishop Mashtos set out to evangelise the neighbouring races of the Caspian Albanians and Georgians—the former suffering martyrdom in the attempt.

I asked a bishop whether the monks devoted themselves to contemplation, or to spiritual writing, and whether there are men qualified for giving spiritual direction to persons needing it. His reply indicated that the monks were too busy with ' practical affairs ' to have time for such things. They have to manage the property of the monastery, entertain guests, and teach in the schools. In their passion for education, one fears that the deeper needs of the soul may be neglected.

In German and other foreign universities, Armenian students are said to be lacking in stability of character, and in a ' hold ' on first principles. This probably indicates a lack of reality in their early religious and moral training. While not withholding criticism, one remembers that these faults are not peculiar to Armenians, and how inevitable it is that economic and political subjection should react on a nation's religion. ' Slavery ' in any form always means

an impoverishment of spiritual life. Among the Armenians the claims of the nation over each individual are tremendously exacting. National loyalty comes before all else. Corporate service, the need to keep together and stand by one another in the common cause, is always and everywhere pressing. Personal religion suffers because individuals have not freedom or leisure to follow their own bent. This should lead us to think indulgently of the faults or failures which we perceive in them.

* * * * * *

Another of the most important, and to me most interesting, features of the Armenian Church is the democratic principle on which she is organised. During the last century many ideas current in the West made themselves felt farther East, and gave a stimulus to all sorts of new activities among Armenians. A new desire for popular education was aroused, for the social amelioration of the peasantry, and so on. But these ideas of freedom and democracy were not at all *new* to the Armenian people. They had been all along the principles of the Armenian Church and had from primitive times found expression in her organisation which is a compromise between Congregationalism and Episcopalianism—all important questions of Church government and administration, including the

election of the Catholicos, being settled by the joint voices of the clergy and the laity.

The Armenian Church combines, in an unusual way, the sacramental with the democratic principle. She is fully 'Catholic' in the sense of absolute insistence on a priesthood and sacraments and of ritual in worship. Yet the final source of authority is always the will of the people. This is fully recognised in the National Constitution of 1863. The Patriarch of Constantinople is, in Turkey, the head of his nation and its official spokesman, but the Turkish Government recognises that he is himself subject to the National Assembly.

The National Assembly of the Armenians sits at Constantinople. It includes two administrative bodies, the Committee for Civil Affairs and the Committee for Ecclesiastical Affairs, both under the presidency of the Patriarch. These two committees are, in their turn, responsible to the whole Assembly which is formed by deputies elected from all parts of Turkey. In purely ecclesiastical questions the Patriarch acts on the advice of the Ecclesiastical Committee only, but in the administration of the Church (election to a see, promotion, Church discipline, &c.) a joint meeting of the two committees has the final deciding voice.

But in Russian Armenia, the Catholicos

nominates the bishops to their sees, according to the 'Polojenje,' which has been drafted, under Russian influence, in harmony with the Russian idea of Church government. Although attempts have often been made to revise the 'Polojenje' in a more democratic sense, all such attempts have been resolutely withstood by the Russian Government.

Popular control extends to almost every branch of the Church's activity. Let me give some instances :—

1. In Turkey all Armenian education is under the direction of lay committees : in Russia the association of the schools with the Church is rather closer, but the same principle obtains. Since 1863 education has been offered to the whole people, and so far as funds permit is absolutely free for all.

2. Again in charitable works, hospitals, and provident institutions we find the same thing. The Armenians, in addition to paying taxes to the State, have voluntarily imposed extra burdens on themselves in order to support such philanthropic agencies.

3. As to the position of the clergy, there is no clerical 'caste' or class out of touch with the people. Here, as in everything else, the sovereignty of the popular will prevails. In the villages the clergy are not only appointed and

paid by their congregations, but where their duties are light and the people poor, they pursue the ordinary avocations of peasants. Before starting on a long day's ride and long before sunrise, one would creep through a low doorway into a little mud-built village church. Here, by the light of two or three candles, the priest, with a small congregation of five or six, was reciting the office for the day. Mass is said generally twice a week, on Saturday and Sunday. After the morning service, which is generally over by 5 A.M., the priest goes out to work in the fields, often accompanied by his wife.

The clergy may be and often are in Turkey ignorant and unlearned men. But the priesthood is a representative priesthood deriving its authority from the baptised community. I asked, 'Is it likely that there will arise an anti-clerical movement—a breach between Church and people as education spreads?' My friend, one of the members of Synod at Etchmiadzin, smiled as he said, 'How can that be? Are not the clergy appointed *by* the people and *for* the people? They have no other end or interest but to serve the people.' The system seems to work wonderfully well and without friction. The clergy are respected but not feared. Each parish has its council composed of laymen elected by popular vote. Baptism and some contribution

to Church funds are the only tests of Church membership.

4. I have here spoken of the parish clergy. The monasteries are not under such direct control. The monasteries are the property of the nation, however, and the monastic system is subject to a Committee of the National Assembly at Constantinople. The words of the Constitution itself show how completely the system is overruled by the test of public usefulness. 'All monasteries are obliged to promote the moral improvement of the nation. Hence each one, according to its capacity, should have a seminary, a library, a printing office, a hospital, and other similar useful establishments.'[1] Although the monasteries have been robbed again and again, especially by Moslems in Russo-Turkish wars, they still have means enough to carry on a great deal of philanthropic and social work.

* * * * * *

Yet another feature distinguishes the Armenian Church from other ancient Churches of Christendom. Through all the ages of controversy she has preserved a primitive simplicity of doctrine. Armenians are fond of quoting the words of their great Apostle and Patron Saint, St. Gregory the Illuminator, who, when the Creed of Nicæa was brought to him with reports

[1] *National Constitution*, vi. 4.

of the theological dissensions at the Council, said, 'As for us, let us glorify Him Who was from before the eternities, worshipping the Holy Trinity and One God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, now and forever.' These words of St. Gregory are repeated in the Liturgy immediately after the Nicene Creed. They are characteristic of the temper of the Armenian Church, for the Armenians never had a great love of theological disputation and preferred to reduce their dogmatic creed to a minimum.

It is a matter of no surprise then to find that the Armenian Church accepts as authoritative only the first three General Councils—Nicæa, Constantinople, and Ephesus. She asserts that later Councils did not represent a unanimous Church and that they cannot, therefore, be binding on the whole of Christendom. The fundamental truths had already been expressed in adequate formulas, and later Councils, only partially representative, could add nothing to them which would have the claim of infallibility. There remained, indeed, both for Churches and individuals, the full liberty of doctrinal explanations and expression, adapted to various modes and stages of thought, and the Armenian Church has taken advantage of this liberty to draw up for herself in her own local Councils and Synods more detailed doctrinal definitions. According

to Armenian theologians, therefore, there is a broad distinction between '*dogmas*,' which are the few fundamental necessary truths—the 'irreducible minimum' of the Christian faith —and '*doctrines*,' the expressions of those fundamental truths which are adopted by any particular Church and which may be modified or expanded according to changing modes of thought and different stages of knowledge. The law of change and development is thus formally recognised in the Armenian Church. The 'life-giving and liberating' Spirit has not left the Christian community. He is believed in as a present source of power to guide and inspire men of God in their search for the truth.

There is no other of the ancient Churches which allows such liberality of thought, and the Armenians claim that this principle is justified by its results. Such a basis has proved sufficiently strong to secure stability, and yet it is not so rigid as to impede intellectual progress or to forbid the free exercise of the reasoning faculties of the individual.

There is no such thing, nor has there ever been such a thing, as ecclesiastical tyranny or persecution in the Armenian Church. And the spirit of her formularies is carried into practice under the present régime at Etchmiadzin. The growing desire for enlightenment

and higher culture is welcomed by the 'powers that be.' One of the members of the Synod, who acted as our host, spoke French and German fluently, as well as Russian. He had been a pupil of Harnack, and is a doctor in theology of Leipzig University. So far as biblical criticism is concerned, the Armenian Church puts no obstacle in the way of study and research. Many of the monks are scholars and critics of a high order, as was noted by the late Bishop Collins of Gibraltar when he visited Armenia.[1]

A word should be said here about Armenian orthodoxy, since it is still a common opinion that this Church holds certain peculiar heretical doctrines which separate her from the rest of Christendom. That this opinion is cruelly unfair has long been the judgment of those who have studied the question. The Armenian Church has been cruelly and deliberately misrepresented by those who would injure her. What are the facts? Orthodoxy asserts the eternal paradox that our Lord Jesus Christ is at once both 'Perfect God and Perfect Man. . . . Who although He be God and Man, yet He is not two, but One Christ.' Now certain heretics in the fourth and fifth centuries endeavoured to explain away this union of two natures in Christ: some by saying that

[1] A. J. Mason, *Life of W. E. Collins, Bishop of Gibraltar*, p. 102.

His divinity was unreal; others by saying that His humanity was unreal. The latter opinion, called Eutychianism, was specially condemned at the General Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451. Now the Armenian nation was not represented at this Council, being engaged at that very time in a deadly struggle with the Sassanian King of Persia, nor did it formally accept the decrees there laid down. Consequently, it was held in many quarters to have condoned the unorthodox opinion in question. Another reason, however, is suggested which explains why the Armenians were not represented. This Council decreed that the Patriarch of Constantinople was to be supreme over all the Eastern Churches and their Patriarchs—an Eastern Pope in fact; and it was this threat to Armenian independence as a National Church that prevented her recognition of the Council.

No complete or fair estimate of a Church can be made without a reference to her Liturgy. Call it what you will—the Mass, the Eucharist, the Communion—it is the chief act of Christian worship, and is common in one form or another to all the Churches. Of what form is the Armenian Liturgy? Has it any particular points of interest? Throughout all the early Liturgies of East and West—the Liturgies of Rome,

Alexandria, Jerusalem, Ephesus, or Odessa—one finds, underlying the variations which distinguish them, a substantial agreement, showing how all are derived from a common source—and that source the old-fashioned primitive service of the early Christians. In early times the Armenian Church was in close connection with Cæsarea in Cappadocia. In the family of Liturgies then, hers is derived directly from that of St. Basil (Cæsarea) and indirectly from that of St. James (Jerusalem). It has the essential elements with which we are familiar in our English Liturgy. To attend Mass in the Armenian Cathedral at Tiflis is a moving experience. The ceremonial is rich and dignified, yet not over-elaborate. With an English translation one can easily follow the words of the Liturgy which are said audibly, or sung in the simple and ancient plain-song of the Armenians. Like other Eastern Liturgies it is divided into two sections. The first part of the service, including the Collects, Epistle, Gospel, and Creed, is called the 'Mass of the Catechumens.' Then follows the 'Mass of the Faithful,' which includes the 'Song of the Cherubim,' a triumphal hymn (unknown to us in the West), the object of which is to excite the minds of the faithful to the mysteries about to be celebrated. At the 'Sursum

Corda' the deacon says: 'The doors! the doors!' — a quaint survival of the order to guard the doors against the Catechumens and the uninitiated, and to admit only the faithful. Then proceeds the Great Oblation, the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, and the Consecration of the Elements. The priest prays aloud as follows:—

'Let this be to us all who draw near to it, our release from condemnation;
Through it grant Love, Security, and the Peace that is so much wanted; to the whole World,
to the Holy Church,
to men who labour and toil,
to those afflicted with sickness.
Grant them speedy relief and health;
Through it give rest to all those who have fallen asleep in Christ;
Remember them, O Lord, and have mercy on them.'

Remembrance is made of Our Lady and the Saints, and of the vast host of martyrs who have died for the Faith. One thinks of the Armenian nation, once a great people, now reduced through wars and persecution to four millions. The choir sings:—

'Christ sacrificed is among us,
Draw near unto the Lord and take of His light.'

And those who are worthy communicate.

The Armenian Liturgy has three Lessons, a Prophetic Lesson from the Old Testament, an Epistle, and a Gospel—a feature which indicates its very early origin. In other Churches, a 'mixed' chalice is used, of wine and water. The reason is that ancient people always mixed water with the wine they drank. The Jews certainly did this. Later, this mixture was looked upon as a symbol of the two natures of Christ, human and divine, or of our union with Him.[1] But the Armenians do not put water into the chalice; in this the Gregorian rite is unique.

Another feature is worth noticing. Since the fourteenth century, when Dominican missionaries spread their influence in the East, certain Latin elements have been adopted in the Armenian rite. Perhaps the most obvious of these is the recitation of the last Gospel (St. John, i. 1–14), which is said publicly in the body of the Church immediately the service is ended.

This chapter does not attempt to deal with the work of other sects in Armenia—Armeno-Greeks (Orthodox), Mekhitarists (Catholic), or Protestants. I need only express my admiration for the fine work of the American missionaries. I believe I am right in saying that 'Proselytism'

[1] See *The Mass*, p. 306, by Adrian Fortescue ('Westminster Library').

was no part of the original intention of the American Mission in Eastern Turkey. The desire of the founders was to provide education of the best quality, and on a definitely Christian basis, for the members of the Armenian Church. This very noble object has been carried out. The poor Armenians of Turkey have no better friends than the American missionaries, and they are fully aware of the fact. The 'strong wine' of American character has been a powerful stimulus to the younger generation of Armenians, both in a moral and intellectual sense. The desire to obtain 'results' and to make advance more rapid, has tempted the Americans in recent years to draw over adherents to their own Congregational Church; but the original purpose of helping the national Church to 'reform from within,' although the more difficult course, is still recognised as a higher ideal. This principle is, I am glad to say, the firm conviction of Dr. Mott, the great missionary statesman, and his weighty influence will no doubt lead to a reconsideration of the newer methods. The Armenian Church, owing to the liberality of her doctrinal statements, lays herself open to the influence of those who would detach members from her fold. But it is most unfair to take advantage of this liberal attitude in theology to weaken a Church which is anxious for reform and is striving for it

under great difficulties, and whose integrity and solidarity are of such *vital* importance to the problem of the liberation of the Armenian race.

We English Christians have a special concern in the Church of the Armenians, arising from various points of contact, moral, ecclesiastical and political. Now and then we come across parish churches in our own land dedicated to the Armenian saint and martyr—Blasius, the patron of woolcombers, who was at one time very popular in this country, and whose name remains in our Kalendar (February 3). Another chapter in this book speaks of the visit of an Armenian king to our shores, and of his efforts in the cause of international peace. In modern times, a sense of moral obligation and of passionate indignation against injustice has stirred the consciences of Englishmen in the Armenian cause. The name of Gladstone is held in great honour among Armenians whose devotion and gratitude are shown in concrete form in Hawarden church. Another point of practical consequence to-day arises from our search for a ground of unity among the churches of Christendom. The principles of the Armenian Church, 'Unitas in necessariis, Libertas in dubiis, Charitas in omnibus,' together with certain features above noted, give her a strong claim to our serious study and attention.

CHAPTER V

MOSLEM STATES

The traveller goes East to seek the charm and colour of a primitive social order—all that varied beauty that is destroyed by 'civilisation.' Who can overrate them? Go and watch, for instance, the big bazaar at Tabriz. The soul must be dead which does not wish to preserve such things; but you must be an artist to picture them. I will venture only to name what lives in the memory.

The winding narrow road, lined with shops, is roofed over with brick domes built in close succession. Between them are arches to support the weight, built with an exquisite Persian curve—the Tudor arch, but less flattened. As you near the end of this tunnelled thoroughfare, the arches, catching the increasing light, stand out with extraordinary effectiveness from the intervening shadows.

The Persian builders delight in brick vaulting, and each dome between the arches is a master-

piece. It is pierced with a hole for air and light, through which a shaft of sunlight strikes down. These shafts, turning the dusty air to gold, give an effect which quite deludes the newcomer. Against the deep shade of the enclosed thoroughfare, where the dust is not visible, they appear to be solid yellow columns supporting the roof. True indeed is Meredith's simile—'Sharp as a sickle is the edge of shade and shine.'

The world of men below is worthy of the setting. The crowd, dressed with an infinity of colour, streams along. The shops, fully open to the street, are unobscured by glass. A whole shop-front, solid with fruit, provides a splash of colour even more brilliant than the dresses of men. No wheeled traffic subdues the sound of voices. One hears the footsteps of men, horses, donkeys—even the soft thud of the camel. A whole quarter is devoted to handicrafts. On the same spot the article is made and sold. Nailmakers ply their tiny forge, two of them hammering deftly in turn at the same glowing metal. Weavers are weaving carpets and selling them then and there. It is an exhibition which the Home Arts Society might envy; a vision of applied arts as they ought to be; fine work in point of efficiency; economic enough for real needs; æsthetically simpler and sounder than ours.

Look back under the vaulted brickwork, lit from the open end of the bazaar with hollow sunlight, and ask yourself, 'Must it all go? Must this road be fifty feet wide with tram-lines and taxis?'

Its charm throws your sympathy dead against reform. But think the matter out further. Must civilisation be without what is good in this bazaar? Not wholly. It is recovering its senses. Mechanicalism will be driven from our art, both fine and applied. The ugliness of factoryism itself is yielding already to smoke-consumers, electric power, and garden cities. Lovely old streets and buildings will be treasured when town planning becomes efficient. Moreover, unreformed government is no security for their preservation. In Turkey they are already scarce. The picturesque features of village life indeed remain, but so they do in lands decently governed, like India and Ceylon. Capitalism does not destroy villages. In any case it provides a necessary stage towards a better order.

And socially (which matters more and affects more people) what does this mediæval bazaar imply? A state of poverty and insanitation that will very soon obtrude on you; dirt, smells, starved horses, savage villages, drought, diseases unknown in the West, beggar-children whose half-blinded eyes haunt the

A STREET IN TABRIZ

memory. Even æsthetically, it means rags, hovels, women veiled and downtrodden. The beauty of this bazaar is the rarefied product of a world of tears. Orderly rule would banish many miseries, and yet preserve what is really beautiful.

* * * * * *

'Pro-Turkism,' as we knew it, personified at its best in the late Lord Percy, appealed to material British interests and friendly sentiments for old allies. It found a following mainly among those who, while seeking a rational argument, are really swayed by an instinct—the admirable instinct embodied in Lord Melbourne's question, 'Why can't you let it alone?' But the defence of Turkey, if it is to succeed, must base itself on a principle worth the name. Such a principle is available in the idea of nationalism. It is desirable that every nation should express itself, where possible, in political as well as cultural life. If the Turks, being a State, are a nation with national feeling, there is everything to say against interference, from the liberal-minded point of view.

Knowing personally the leading 'Young Turks,' and having a great liking for them, my natural inclination is in their favour. Reform

from within is the ideal solution. Independence is *per se* desirable, both in Turkey and Persia, and in every state, whether Christian, Mohammedan, or Buddhist, because it calls out the energies of a nation. But specially is it desirable in Turkey, owing to the great difficulty of effecting a substitute, and because the component races of Asia Minor do not lend themselves to autonomy.

Let us then apply with the utmost impartiality the tests by which in these days independence of government must stand or fall. Fitness to remain uncontrolled will be judged by capacity to meet the standard of the modern world in regard to such things as the development of trade; facilities for capitalist exploitation (a different matter to the last); homogeneity of population; the welfare of the subjects of the state in question, not forgetting the ruling race itself; and the rights of ancient conquest.

1. Trade.—The manufacturing nations in their desire to sell goods must promote the capacity of other countries to buy them and cannot leave them undeveloped. They are also becoming increasingly conscious of the need of raw material. The case of cotton provides an illustration. Turkey and Persia contain great potential cotton-lands, mostly unworked, not to speak of corn-lands unused. The British Government itself is spending money on cotton

cultivation to meet the anxieties of Lancashire. The diversion of rich lands to waste, will, as a matter of simple fact, cause increasing dissatisfaction in the West.

2. EXPLOITATION.—There is already in Turkey a fresh scramble for concessions, backed by each of the Great Powers, and every one of them will lead to further penetration, in geometrical progression. The above two tests are the pretext for intervention in Persia.

3. HOMOGENEOUS POPULATION, while it supports the claim of Persia, is conspicuously wanting in Turkey.

4. THE WELFARE OF THE SUBJECT RACES.—This is, in fact, the matter which has brought Turkey, though not Persia, into notice.

5. THE WELFARE OF THE GOVERNING RACE.—This is too little studied. It is important to remember that the end in view is not the diminution of suffering alone (which mainly affects the oppressed), but the increase of morality, culture, and comfort, which affect the oppressor at least as much.

6. RIGHT OF ANCIENT CONQUEST, THE CLAIM OF 'PROPERTY' AND 'PRESCRIPTION,' might be held to establish the claim to independence. But the practice of the Great Powers in recent days—as, e.g. in Tripoli, Bosnia, Persia, China, not to mention their endorsement of the aggression of

the Balkan States—seems to indicate that this right is obsolete.

Turkey and Persia are the only remaining truly independent states of Islam, and their preservation is of proportionately greater interest. In each case recent events have furnished new material for an opinion. They have also superseded the reflections of the accepted experts, for those events contradicted the judgment of the men of knowledge, and, with the exception of Sir Edwin Pears, the experts have not, since the revolutions in question, published their views.

Persia

The case of Persia should be considered first, because it is a true nation and not merely an empire; therefore, if the need of interference is conceded as to Persia, it is *prima facie* conceded for Turkey. Thus the constitutional Persian movement, and the action of Russia, are relevant. They are also relevant to our main subject because they affect the Armenian race, which is quite contented in Persia, and because it is the action of England in Turkey which helped to divert Russian activity into Persian channels.

What can be said for the 'national' movement in Persia? Feeble as the Parliament proved, it produced men whose force—both as revolutionists and as deputies—was a source of

surprise to the most cynical. The Armenian Yeprem, and the Persian Takizade, represented elements of strength and public spirit which would not otherwise have seen the light. The deputies themselves compelled attention to moral questions which personal government ignored. For instance, the encouragement (for blackmail) of certain nameless trades in vice, by the Teheran police, was attacked. Again, a governor who had grown rich by seizing Persian girls and selling them to Tartar chiefs, across the Russian border, was impeached. These are examples. This is not the place to enlarge in detail. When all the laughter due to the Mejliss is exhausted, it remains a fact that fanatical feeling, as missionaries attest, has been halved by the Persian parliamentary régime. The very Mullahs who predominated in it have, through its existence, become unpopular, and liberty, even for Moslems turned Christians, has vastly increased.

It is argued on the other hand that men who made good agitators, and even fighters, have proved to be self-seekers when power was achieved—a common feature of human nature in all revolutions. Another charge made among Persians, and explained to me by a leading reactionary, connected with the ex-Shah, is that the national movement and its disorders gave occasion to the Russians to come

in. Many Europeans, again, who supported the Constitution at first, are pessimistic now. In their opinion the autocracy of the Shahs and their corrupt creatures, though it may not rise above the level of Mahomet Ali, or Shuaes-Sultane, produces still, through sporadic personal energy, the greatest modicum of public order that can be expected. The common people only ask for security from thieves and murderers. The educated classes, also, despair of getting this without foreign control. Even English traders, if Russian control can be had without Russian import duties, begin to welcome it. The most hopeful feature lies in the marked success of the Swedish gendarmerie officers, whose work again depends on the Belgian customs officials, and for maintaining these in due authority a parliament may prove to have its use.

Personal government is best studied in the kind of governor that it produces. A conspicuous and indeed notorious illustration is Shujah-ed-Dowlah, whose company I enjoyed at his house in Tabriz. We sat in a beautiful room, the west side fully open to the ground, overlooking a steep garden. Shujah had taken the house by force from a rich Persian, and I was not surprised, for the garden, with a great bed of mauve petunias below the terrace, by the pool, was a marvel. He is an old man now, very

handsome with his big white moustache, enlarged by a share of what is more legitimately whisker ; he might pass for a French ex-general, tanned by a Moroccan campaign. We talked about Omar Khayyám, Lord Curzon, Abdul Hamid, the Armenians, and the Constitution. He was frankly reactionary ; had no use at all for the Government at Teheran, the regent, or other 'men of books' ; the ex-Shah was his ideal. One might expect a governor to respect, if not to represent, the view of his chief ; but there lies the peculiarity of Persian governors. They can sometimes establish themselves by their own acts—by violence and force of character. Shujah followed the Russians into Tabriz, when they assisted the Shah's troops to overcome its constitutional defenders. He became their protégé and did their dirty work, and made himself governor. He wanted to know what English people thought of Persia. I remembered one of the ugly deeds which attracted attention to Persia in London—the hanging of the chief Moslem priest in Tabriz. But I refrained. It was Shujah himself who hanged him.

Shujah is cruel, but he punishes brigands and provides security on the roads. He has no salary ; there are other ways of making an income when you are a despot. He is

said to be at his best when out hawking. He gives you the argument for reaction in words ; some of his deeds are certainly arguments against it.

The parliamentary experiment, working as it did under abnormal difficulties, can by no means be dismissed as futile. Russian policy was at the time peculiarly hostile. The action of England was so much deflected by the state of her relations with Germany, that the influence she exerted had little reference to her view of the Persian question itself. All that can be affirmed is that a national assembly was well worth a trial, and that trial it did not get. Diplomacy itself is tied to traditions, which make a trial difficult. It has relied so long on its partisan friendship for one statesman or another, in weak states like Persia and Turkey, that by nature it hampers a national régime. It contradicts the idea of self-respect without which no national government could be vigorous. But its traditions may come abreast of the times, and when that day arrives, the forlorn hopes of feeble nations will have a better chance.

Turkey

In Turkey the new régime, chequered as its career has been, has endured, partly because the Turks are more virile than the Persians. Its

troubles were largely due to the impossible task (set by the Powers in 1878) of holding the European provinces. Their loss in 1913 has made it more possible that new Turkey will succeed. The Young Turks have the knack of making enemies, not only among 'humanitarians,' but among 'pro-Turks,' because these are lovers of the *status quo* and dislike reformers, even when they are Turks. The bitterness of their critics makes one inclined to give them all possible credit.

Their Christian subjects have special reasons for thinking them more dangerous than Abdul Hamid himself—but from the standpoint of the European who desires mere personal security and liberty, it is not true that the Young Turks have failed entirely.

Let me illustrate from the chance observations of travel in Armenia. I had not lingered in Turkish country districts since 1907 (a year before the Constitution), and the contrast was surprising. Men whom it was then impossible to see, because it would get them into trouble, now readily associate with foreigners and talk even in open places without fear. Schools and clubs are being rapidly built, even clubs of the dreaded Dashnak Society. Taxes are not collected with the old brutality—formerly the last fuel and the bedding of the sick were taken. Armenian village police guards have been appointed. On many roads

you may drive without an escort. Letters are delivered, even to agitators. Great progress in education has been made possible. Many regiments are largely Christian, the artillery mainly Armenian. Newspapers attack the Government. Above all, travel is allowed without passports. An Armenian school inspector visiting his schools obtains a gendarme escort; and Armenians from Russia may be found travelling for pleasure, taking photographs, and writing up local archæology.

What is to be said on the other side? It is urged by most Christians that not only are these cheering signs negative and trifling, but that the situation is positively worse than of old. It is worse in this way, that liberty has been tasted (after the revolution the Kurds feared possible punishment, and desisted from crime) and is now lost. It is worse in that Young Turks are more intelligent than old ones, and the danger of permanent subjection is, therefore, greater. Again, the Kurds, dreading the approach of reform, are more alert and active. Armenian emigration is thereby increased, and the national cause is jeopardised.

* * * * * *

The onlooker who seeks an answer to the question, 'Ought Europe to intervene?' may well arrive at one answer or the other. Both

views of such a problem are justified, more especially to the traveller in Turkey, where one of the strangest features is the juxtaposition of good and bad. Scenes of peace which would elsewhere indicate order, are immediately succeeded by evidence of chaotic insecurity. Peasants who protest to your gendarme that your driver has taken their corn and refused to pay—protest as if all the machinery of justice were at their disposal—are the next moment ridden down and flogged as if flogging were the gendarme's habitual amusement. There is no system; there is only a capricious freedom for privileged classes. Thus, unless he enquires closely and has means of knowing the people, an observer may, according to the hazard of his experience, with equal honesty defend the Turkish régime or condemn it.

Certain facts, however, forbid the rational critic to 'sit on the fence.'

1. The Armenians, whose favourable opinion of Young Turks at the time of their brilliant *coup d'état* justified the support given to Young Turks in England and France, see now that the possession of power destroyed their progressive ideals and revived their native chauvinism. The best hope for young Turkey lay in the offers of full support from the most active race in Asiatic Turkey. If the reformers could, and would,

defy the fanatics who resent the punishment of a Moslem for crime against a Christian, would waive their claim to racial ascendency over the Armenians and make an alliance with them, they could maintain domination perhaps over all the other races, including the Kurds, and avoid European intervention. There is still a powerful section of Armenians who hope and work for this solution. But difference of temperament—democratic versus feudal; intellectual versus fanatical—makes the prospect of adequate evolution practically *nil*. The Turks, having rejected Armenian help, have elected to be judged by their own policy. It contains further features of a startling character.

2. The pro-Kurdish policy continues. Kurds, who have taken service with the Government, themselves protest against the licence accorded to their countrymen. A gendarme of this kind showed an admirably detached mind. Riding along with us as escort, he illustrated his point thus: 'Look at that village. I could go there and kill half a dozen people. Who would punish me? I am a Kurd.'

A certain post-carriage was escorted by four *zaptiehs*. Passing through Kurd country they arrived at night minus their rifles. They returned home, were again armed, and again were robbed. The course of events was repeated

GENDARMES AND ARMENIAN PEASANTS

A RUSSIAN CONSUL IN TURKISH ARMENIA

next time. Humorous residents say it became normal. The governor's solution of the problem was to continue sending an escort, but to send it without arms.

Just before our visit to Van a girl of nine was raped by a Kurd. One of the Consuls supported the villager's complaint; the Kurd for the sake of courtesy was imprisoned for a few days, but was then released.

These things are comparative trifles. The great question of the lands seized by Kurds in the massacre days is more important. This vast robbery is unremedied even after five years of 'constitutional' rule. One rash Armenian, applying to the Court, was granted an injunction and presented it to the Kurd, who occupies the ancestral farm. The latter lost no time in killing the Armenian. Doubtless the Turkish judge enjoyed his joke.

Early every morning you may see the door of a Russian consulate besieged by applicants for passports. Life among Kurds, they say, is 'not good enough,' and the villagers are leaving for Russia or America. At Igdir, just out of Turkey, we saw many refugees. A woman, whose children ranged from five upwards, had lost her husband in the massacre of March 1908; lately a Kurd had burnt the house of her neighbour; so she and her brother decided to leave.

We asked how long it took them to walk (with four children) from their village, from which we had driven in four days. They said fifteen.

The Turks, hampered as they are by the fanaticism of their uneducated masses, and wanting in energy, fail to suppress crime. Their defect is thus partly negative; some functions of government they cannot, and some they will not, perform. But it is also positive—the Kurds they actually arm with modern rifles. The Armenians do not ask to be protected, they only complain that they may not protect themselves. Wolves and bears can live in the same hills, even in the same cage, without harming each other. But in this case the bear has had his claws drawn. While the bear may not use his claws, the wolf is given better teeth. What all this means it is hard for the stranger to imagine. Once or twice the reality dawned on me.

There comes a moment in pack-horse travelling which brings a peacefulness of quite a special charm. It is when the men have taken the baggage from you in the early dawn and are, with infinite dawdling, putting it on the saddles. They may complain that you are late; and you may say the same of them, foreseeing the misery of arriving at some dirty hovel in the evening after dark; but no activity on your part will move them faster; and if you are wise you will

sit down again in your own room and smoke. The moment affords in some strange way a pipe of superfine tranquillity. Such a moment came at X. A priest, a learned man, sat with me in the little room. Conversation ceased, and I smoked in peace while he leant on the table, sitting on the bed which served for chairs, his chin on his hands. I looked hard at the black figure in profile, thrown into artistic relief by the extreme simplicity of the setting. In the perceptive quietness of the moment the scene recalled Whistler's picture of his mother. The bare mud wall was like the brown-paper walls affected by the æsthetic in England. The priest faced the window, which was on my right, and in the strong light I saw that this man, with short moustache and beard, resembled some of the portraits of Christ. Forgetting himself as we sat silent, the priest sighed deeply. Then, for an instant I seemed to realise the outlook of the Armenian, the world in which he spends his days, when we pass on our agreeable path, with our equipment for pleasure, our perfect security, our prospect of early return to civilisation. Till four years ago the very monastery in this village was occupied by Turkish troops. The priest had been sent to revive a scattered flock, and defend a group of Armenian villages in the hills around. Yesterday he had buried a

peasant—killed by Kurds, left mutilated for many days, till he was found by chance. His villagers' houses were daily seized by Kurds favoured by the Government. Could we not stay to see them? I feared this would only bring further trouble on himself and the village clergy who would show us the houses. 'What do we care?' he said. 'They can do nothing worse to us than they do already.'

3. The more positive side of the Turkish evil is conspicuous in the policy of Moslem settlement—the placing of *mohajir* among Christians, to keep them in order. Its wisdom has been much debated in Turkish circles. Its great advocate is the brilliant doctor, Nazim Bey, of Salonica, who successfully urged the importation of Bosnian Moslems in 1910 and 1911. Two generations ago the Circassians, removed from Russian rule in the Caucasus, were planted as *mohajir* both in Europe and Asia. Neither of these precedents is a happy one. The Circassians effected the Batak massacre of 1876, which cost Turkey four provinces. The poor Bosnians had a short stay in their new homes, sometimes newly built for them on waste land. I saw those villages standing empty in 1912, when the Bosnians, at the approach of the Bulgarian army, had moved in haste still further from Bosnia. The latest form of the *mohajir*

method we came on by chance in Armenia. A large number of Kurds, objecting to the order established by the Russians in Persia, west of Lake Urmi, had crossed to the Turkish side of the frontier, which had just been fixed so as to correct the recent encroachment of Turkey's troops near Salmas. We found many Kurd families installed in an Armenian village, the ejected population being crowded into the remaining houses. Other peasants had been notified to give up their houses, by a fixed date, to Kurds still occupying their summer tents. This was not the usual phenomenon of robbery. It was systematically ordered and carried out by authority—Vali, Kaimakam, Mudir, and Zaptieh —a far more scandalous matter. It proved to be in force in numbers of other villages. In the capital of the vilayet, the consuls had actually not heard of it three weeks later, so little was it regarded as out of the ordinary. The Vali did not deny, but frankly discussed, the system. He quaintly urged the difficulty of otherwise finding houses for Kurds. The consular machinery of information through native dragomans, often thought to produce exaggeration, had in this case missed an event which would be of more real political significance than Kurdish outrage. Yet this vilayet is considered the quietest of all.

4. In the eyes of Armenians, however, this is not the most serious charge. Their judgment is affected, and naturally, by the memory of actual massacres, and this judgment we are bound to consider, because unhappily the constitution of 1908 did not see the end of them. The argument that under the new régime such things cannot happen, has perished. Now, if we are to understand the bearing of this fact, we need, not so much to read statistics and consular reports, as to get into the point of view of those who have known the experience for themselves.

One meets, of course, great numbers of those who saw the great massacres, but, without an interpreter who inspired Armenian confidence, one would hear nothing. We were making friends with an attractive child aged four when his father murmured something to our interpreter. I asked what he was saying. There had been no mention of Turks or troubles, and I was surprised when I learnt the thought which had occurred to him. It was expressed thus : ' They killed thousands of boys like that one, in the massacres.'

On arriving at a certain Armenian house an old woman's face struck us at once as possessing charm and promise, and we were distinctly disappointed to find her cold, sad, and un-

responsive. Not a smile could we bring to her face. Our cheerless quarters, after supper, demanded the solace of cocoa, and the housewife accepted a cup. She had done her best to wait on us, providing hot water (she had little else), and it pleased her now to have us turn the tables by serving her from our own tea-basket. Our polyglot companion drew her into general talk. It turned in time to her children. Why was she alone? Because her daughter had lately married and gone. She was ill at a distant town. She was only about twenty years old. That recalled the fatal time—1895—and, encouraged by another cup of cocoa, she fell to talking about the days of massacre. The thing which absorbed her mind, and made her mournfully silent, now made her eloquent.

The scene became arresting—the old woman; the thrilling voice; the handsome features, framed in a black scarf; and set off by the severely simple room. She would have made a portrait for Rembrandt.

Had she seen people killed?—'We heard the shrieks, and smelt the burnt bodies everywhere.' Where was she and her children?—'I was here—but not in this house—it was burnt down. The English money helped me to rebuild it afterwards. They broke in the door. I got away, just in time, with my children

by the back door.' Was it by night ?—'There was no day or night; we never slept for days.' Had anyone been left in her house ?—'A crowd had taken refuge there. They chose out many girls and took them away, and also boys. We never saw them again.' It made me think of 'Riders to the Sea,' and the mother's voice when she bewailed her son. 'We who saw it,' she went on, 'can't believe in your talk about Turks reforming themselves.' Remembering Adana and the melancholy fact that these things occurred again under 'Young Turkey,' we were silent.

Is there, in spite of all, a hope that, with patience and time, the mustard seed of progress may grow to be a tree which can justify the claim of Turkey to independence ? I fear there is not. Those who act on this hope are consciously deceiving themselves. It would be useful (in view of the jumble of nationalities) if Turks and Armenians, working together, would make of Asia Minor a regenerated state; but the fancy is idle. The Turkish mental defect—whether of religion or temperament—is deep seated. It carried with it three fatal features :—

1. The absence of education. Even with the incentive of social and governmental advance-

ment, the Tartars in Russia remain ignorant. One of them regretfully remarked to me, 'Bei uns ist kein Kultur.'

2. The subjection of women, and consequent debasement of men, remains a final bar.

3. The spirit of ascendency appears insuperable. Its votaries outweigh the forces of progress with ease.

* * * * * *

The fitness of a Government to survive depends partly on the quality of the governed. Are the Armenians fit for civilisation? With allowance for every fault, most certainly they are. We have noted their energy in commerce and education; their indomitable resilience, perhaps not equalled by any other race. They have been charged with timidity, but there are British Consuls who blame them rather for too reckless courage. Abroad they are found unattractive, at home they appear sturdy, and many who live among them call them lovable. In view of all this, their grievance is too great to be tolerated, or its settlement postponed to the season convenient for Europe. It is both cultural and economic, but above all it is one of personal and moral insecurity. A people of this kind, not ordinary but highly gifted, are artificially subjected to a system unfitted even for the government of savages. 'Lesser breeds,'

as Kipling called them, are sometimes regarded as beings whose disappearance does not matter, unless they increase our dividends by their labour. Civilised peoples are viewed as having an importance in themselves, and also (as commercial markets) to other races of men. But a third class is recognised—the few nations who make a contribution to the arts and culture, which the world cannot afford to lose. What is not sufficiently recognised is that to this small class belongs the Armenian race.

The solution, by Turkish reform from within, must be discarded, judiciously but absolutely. The evidence is final and (in the fullest sense) damning.

CHAPTER VI

THE FUNCTION OF THE POWERS

THERE are not wanting those who, fully aware of the facts which we have reviewed, hold that this is no business of ours. This is not the place to inquire whether such a view is in flat contradiction to philosophy and religion. It is answered, for practical people, by the plain fact that Europe has for long years played a part in shaping the life of the Armenians. The motive has often, it is true, been self-interest, but action has also, at many periods, been inspired by higher motives. This is due to the large number of people interested in the question, through humanitarian feeling, love of liberty, concern for religious missions, or personal acquaintance with Armenians, who are to be found in England, Germany and France. In England that interest has led to results of surprising importance. The Turkish question brought a new Government to power in 1880. The Armenian cause split the Liberal party in

the 'nineties and brought about the resignation of its leader. Mr. Gladstone's last great speech was made in order to urge action in the Armenians' favour. His private appeal, in his days of weakness on the Riviera, was for young and new recruits for their cause.

The public movement thereby implied was not spasmodic, nor was it the tool and creature of party feeling. Throughout the whole of this period it has persisted in the form of philanthropic work—a truer proof of interest than any other. French missions and German societies have continued their educational and orphanage work and have met with wide support. The most notable service of this kind has moreover been rendered by America, whose schools and hospitals might almost be called the makers of modern Armenia. In England a multitude of workers, conspicuous among whom are 'The Friends of Armenia,' led by Lady Frederick Cavendish, have laboured with extraordinary persistency. It is clear that a great army of responsible citizens have realised not only that dire distress called for Samaritan assistance, but that an overwhelming debt remains to be paid owing to the action of the British Government in protecting Turkey. The sacrifice of a nation, and its subjection to anarchy, for the supposed advantage of distant commercial

populations, living in European homes, is regarded as a tragedy which compels exceptional effort.

Tyranny has been the unavoidable lot of captive peoples from prehistoric times; but here was a case of misrule (unsurpassed even in early ages) prolonged in a world which has the means of ending it, through the artificial prevention of its natural cure—namely, the defeat and absorption of a barbaric state by one of higher civilisation. That this scandal is widely felt, is proved by the vast number of workers for the Armenians. The conscience of the civilised world has found in them its vindication. Theirs is not to stand appalled at the spectacle of a people inexplicably doomed to martyrdom, or to philosophise on the function of innocent sufferers in the scheme of things. In season and out of season they have pushed an unpopular cause. I remember well the boredom with which one associated their efforts to make one understand or subscribe. As a matter of fact their peculiarity lay in possessing imagination, and indeed it is the absence of that un-English quality that has made the pro-Turkish policy of England possible. To some Englishmen the perception of that policy's enormous cruelty has never come till, standing in an Armenian church, following a translation

of that Church's illuminating Liturgy, and noting the sublime spirit of its services, they have begun to understand the outlook of these sufferers for a faith, and reflected on the position of those who perpetuate their pain *sub specie eternitatis*.

* * * * * *

It is not however in charity, but in political action, that the final remedy lies. In this sphere fuller interest is no less widely diffused, but agitation has been minimised in recent years by one paralysing consideration. Since the massacres of 1895, the fear has naturally prevailed that agitation in Europe might cause their repetition. Not till the financial needs of Turkey, after the Balkan War, brought the Armenian question again upon the *tapis*, was a new Armenia Committee formed in England. Its chairman is a politician conspicuous for ability and self-effacement, and its secretary has the rare qualification of a training in the Armenian movement by Gladstone. Similar committees, which have sent delegates to confer in London, operate in Germany, Switzerland, Russia, and France. But even so, public utterance has been minimised through the fear of massacre.

This question must be faced at the outset. Many of us have felt the need of deferring participation in the Armenian cause till we became acquainted with Armenians in Turkey, but it

has now become evident that their opinion is decidedly against the reality of such fears. They know the history of the massacres, and are of opinion that Abdul Hamid ordered them, not because of agitation in the West, nor because this agitation may have encouraged the revolutionaries to attack Turks. They think it was his deliberate method of reducing the Armenians to mental and numerical weakness, and, even so, would not have been ventured upon unless the Powers had shown themselves impotent from the first. The danger, they think, is now minimised by the great number of Christians in the army, and still more so by the known fact that Russia will invade Turkey, if massacres occur. Armenians are intensely anxious that this consideration should no longer impede what they think of vital importance, namely, agitation in their favour. Europeans must judge for themselves the value of Armenian knowledge and judgment. In our opinion, if massacres occur, it will be by the decision of the Government as before, and that decision will be made not more likely, but less, by European concern.

If public movements are not dangerous, we are certainly under an obligation to support the British Government in a definite policy. But though it is generally agreed that past policy should be condemned, it is less easy to see what

method of reversing that policy can be urged. To do an injury is usually easier than to undo it.

No opinion on policy can be of much value which does not take into account past history, both distant and recent. Let us, therefore, recall to mind the outstanding facts. They are already familiar and a brief allusion will suffice.

1453. The Turks take Constantinople.

1683. They besiege Vienna, but are defeated by John III. (Sobieski), King of Poland.

1787. Russia proposes partition of Turkey in Europe : England, France, Austria, and Spain to share the spoils.

1790–1800. English trade with India, and consequent fear of Russia, causes Pitt to propose British support for Turkey. Burke, Fox and Grey protest.

Anglo-Russian rivalry henceforth dominates the situation.

1803. Russia takes Tiflis and pursues the conquest of the Caucasus, a partly Armenian country.

1827. England, France and Russia destroy the Turkish fleet at Navarino.

1828. The semi-independent Armenian princes of the Caucasus help Russia to defeat Persia, in exchange for protection and promises of an Armenian kingdom. Together they take Erivan.

Erzerum is also taken, but restored to Turkey by the Treaty of Adrianople, 1829.

1830. Greece declared independent.

1840. Stratford Canning's term of influence at Constantinople begins.

1844 AND 1853. The Czar Nicholas proposes to England the partition of Turkey, and is twice refused.

1854. Russia's attempt to obtain protectorship of the Eastern Christians alarms England and France. They proclaim the rights of Europe as a whole. Lord Aberdeen tells the Turks England will not tolerate injustice for Christians. The Cabinet yields to pressure and joins in the Crimean War.[1] Pro-Turkish policy now begins to affect Armenia. The Russian troops are forced to retire from Kars.

1856. Treaty of Paris. Turkish edict 'Hatti Humayum' proclaiming equality of religions.

1863. Armenian 'National Constitution' published.[2]

1863–1875. Armenians remain unorganised and Kurds continue hostile to Turks, but national feeling revives through writings of Raffi and others. Liberal movements of Sultan Abdul Mejid and Midhat Pasha in Turkey.

[1] *Vide* Duke of Argyll's *Our Responsibility for Turkey*.
[2] *Vide* Lynch's *Armenia*.

1875–1878. Massacres in Bosnia and Bulgaria. Russia's reform proposals rejected by other Powers. Lord Salisbury and General Ignatieff at Constantinople. Mr. Bryce visits Russian Armenia and finds Russians indignant at England's refusal to join in protecting Christians. Russian armies invade Turkey. Kars taken by an Armenian General. Treaty dictated at San Stefano, by which (Article 16) Russia remains at Erzerum till reforms are carried out. Anglo-Turkish convention secretly secures Turkish Armenian frontier, and assigns Cyprus to England. Berlin Congress reverses San Stefano, and by Article 61 makes the Powers jointly responsible for reform. Lord Beaconsfield returns from Berlin and announces 'Peace with honour.'

1879. Lord Beaconsfield sends military consuls to Armenian centres. Abdul Hamid instigates Kurds against Armenians and forms the 'Hamidie' cavalry.

1880. Return of Gladstone Government. Goschen sent as Ambassador to Constantinople. Turkey soon afterwards coerced (*re* Thessaly) at Dulcigno.

1881. Bismarck's opposition induces Lord Granville to drop the question of reform for Armenia.

1894–6. Organised massacres of Armenians in sight of the embassies at Constantinople.

Series of proposals for reform. Lord Rosebery decides that coercion is not feasible. Russia hostile to joint schemes. The German Emperor visits the Sultan and proclaims his friendship. The Sultan, having reduced the Armenians to a minority, appoints 'Assistant Christian Governors.'

1896. They become known as 'Evetji'—men who say 'Yes'—to their Turkish colleagues.

1896–1908. The German concession-policy is pursued, at first with British support. It culminates in the Bagdad railway enterprise which, as a joint concern, is at first agreed to by England, but is dropped through the opposition of anti-Germans in England. It is pursued by Germany alone, better terms being obtained in 1907. The German Ambassador is supreme at Constantinople.

1903–7. Insurrection, massacre, and reform scheme in Macedonia. Foreign officers and officials 'inspect' gendarmerie and finance.

1908. Massacre at Van in March.

1908. Young Turkish revolution. Constitution. Fraternisation of Turks with Christians, especially Armenians.

1909. Abdul Hamid removed. Massacres at Adana.

1910. Chauvinism among Young Turks leads to attempts to terrify and disarm Albanians,

Arabs, and Bulgarians, but not Kurds. It leads to co-operation of Bulgars, Greeks, and Serbs and produces—

1912. The Balkan War and loss of European provinces.

1913. Powers confer upon reform for Armenia as the condition of financial aid for Turkey. Rumours of Russia's intention to invade Armenia. Germany opens new consulate at Erzerum.

1914. Scheme of supervision of reforms agreed on.

This series of events, differing from any other recorded set of international actions, suggests a variety of reflections, philosophic and practical.

1. For our special purpose, one may naturally begin by asking, 'What would have happened if England and other Powers had let the thing alone?' This is not a matter of vague conjecture, but of fact. Russia's proposal was to divide the Turkish Empire with other Powers. These Powers having other ideas, her alternative project was, in 1854, to 'protect' (i.e. insist on decent treatment of) the Christians; and in 1878, to hold a Turkish strategic point (Erzerum) till abuses had been removed.[1] If Russia had

[1] *Vide* Map.

not been baulked, the great massacres would not have occurred.

But the question may be put more generally thus, What might be called the normal or 'constitutional' procedure in a case like this? It may be answered, Things would have worked out as in other similar cases. Europe, when the events which we have reviewed began, controlled little territory outside her own frontiers. The half-civilised governments lying next her borders have, roughly speaking, been taken over by the European States nearest to hand. From Morocco to Turkestan they have assumed 'the white man's burden.' Disorder next to a civilised country is a nuisance which leads to annexation. As Austria moved down into Hungary, Croatia, and Bosnia, so Russia was naturally moving into Caucasia and Eastern Anatolia. The races of these lands, having lost their freedom long before, could not complain if their only hope lay in transference from a barbarous empire to a better one. The Armenians and other Christians of Turkey could only expect this normal fate. What they are entitled to complain of is that this fate was artificially denied them.

2. It is hardly now denied that the policy of opposing Russia has proved a delusion. Lord Salisbury's blunt confession—'We put our

money on the wrong horse '—might have been taken only to mean that Bulgaria proved the best obstacle to Russia. But at the end of a century of Russophobia we now find the Foreign Office promoting an Anglo-Russian *entente*, organising Parliamentary expeditions to St. Petersburg, and working with Russia in the chief field of former rivalry—namely, Persia. This is not merely the result of our occupation of Egypt. It is indeed held in high quarters (*vide* Sir Valentine Chirol) that, owing to this fact, our alarms as to Russia on the Dardanelles have become groundless. But seeing that Russia, with her vast new development, remains, in spite of the Japanese war, the greatest Power of the future, the change of front indicates also that in opposing Russia we were not swayed by logic and reason. Mr. Gladstone's protest against the Turcophil policy was the voice of worldly wisdom. We must always, it seems, have some enemy to fear and dislike. When the German ' enemy ' arose Russophobia died of inanition. The Foreign Office, to which mysterious and abnormal wisdom is still attributed, has had no difficulty at all in transforming public opinion.

3. Whether the anti-Russian policy was an error or not, its price has been great. First, to ourselves. The nemesis has been the rivalry with Germany. We preserved Turkey. Ger-

many, seeking expansion, would have been brought into collision there with Russia, but for our attitude. Meanwhile, the commercial gains have gone not to us but to her. It may also be said that we debarred Germany, by defending Turkey, from finding that colonial pre-occupation for want of which she remains restive and jealous. Moreover the economic loss to commercial States through non-development of rich lands is obvious.

It has seldom been contended that in diplomacy it pays to be moral, but it would appear that the contention may contain a germ of truth.

The cost, to the populations concerned, whether the policy which caused it was justified or not, should be noted. Bulgarians, Servians, Greeks, and Armenians have been (to speak within the mark) impoverished, robbed, raped, and debarred from progress. Their numbers have not only been thus retarded, but have been reduced by massacre, variously estimated at from 100,000 to 200,000 in 1894–6, and at 15,000 in 1909. In addition, the liberation of Macedonia, which had already been effected in January 1878 by Russia, but was reversed at the instance of England and Germany, was imposed on small and rival states (in 1912) and therefore involved a loss (not regarding property, or disablement

by wounds) of over 400,000 lives of soldiers and non-combatants.

4. The disasters which have befallen the Turkish Empire would have been avoided by even a very slight willingness to reform. The Powers have naturally caught at the slightest excuse for avoiding the discomforts of exerting joint diplomatic pressure, and the great difficulties of coercion. Diplomacy, undiscouraged by innumerable experiences, even now holds out the hope that the Turks will have learnt wisdom by misfortune. Why have they never done so? Partly because the so-called 'Turcophils' have again and again led them to think they will be supported in resistance to reform. 'Pro-Turks' regard 'anti-Turks' as the stupider party, claiming superior wisdom, knowledge, and freedom from bias. But something must be lacking in an attitude which has not only failed to secure 'British interests' but led the Turks to ruin. What is their defect? It is the want of a principle. If their view were based on genuine care for Islamic culture, like that of Prof. Browne, or if they supported the reforming Turks, they would have formed a clientèle of real weight. Their futility was illustrated in November 1912. On the defeat of Turkey at Lule Burgas, opining that British 'interests' now required adhesion

to the other side (the expected Balkan Power) many of them threw the Turks over. Advocates of this kind do not appeal to the British mind. They may imagine themselves superior, but they misjudge the forces which control the world's course.

5. History shows, again, that the Concert, never faster than a 'steam-roller,' can seldom move at all, and never with effect, except in regard to frontiers. It determined the boundaries of Thessaly and Montenegro in 1881, of Crete in 1898, and of Albania in 1913. All committees are cumbersome, and this committee has a minimum of common aims. None are efficient without a recognised leader, and to recognise one Power as leader infringes the *amour propre* of the others. The nearest approach to the requisite chairmanship was that of England during the Balkan War; but the unique prestige of a Sir Edward Grey is not a factor that can be counted on to appear whenever it is needed; even with its aid, the Concert failed to enforce its avowed will, when the Turks defied the Treaty of London by retaking Adrianople. As with commercial 'rings' it pays some of the parties to break away. Each Power can secure a gain, at the critical moment, by befriending Turkey in return for goods received. Loan-mongers,

concession hunters, or armament firms can usually upset a disinterested policy.

6. Such leadership as the Concert permits can only produce intervention of a feeble kind. Lord Lansdowne worked with admirable persistence from 1903 to 1905 for reforms in Macedonia. He laboured for control, but could only secure supervision. And one of the chief conclusions to be drawn from history is that supervision is worse than useless. The 'Vienna scheme' and the 'Murzteg scheme' produced 'civil assessors,' foreign gendarmerie officers, and financial advisers, but the actual result was an increase of irritation, rivalry, and political outrage. The officers, and the embassies, were largely occupied in compiling statistics of murders which they could not prevent—a 'butcher's bill' which reached 2400 lives per annum. The moral need hardly be reiterated—that without administrative European control, interference is positively harmful.

7. We can, since 1903, adjudicate on the alternative of reform from within. The reader will recollect its main features. What is to be noted in regard to the Powers is that they do not make reform of this kind easy. To succeed, it must be the work of responsible Ministers, relying on national self-respect. But foreign embassies, with their traders and residents

living a privileged life under the 'capitulations,' have something to lose by that self-respect itself; and diplomacy, which has worked for the advantage of its particular country by siding with one Turkish statesman or another, cannot break loose from old traditions unless the national revival be of invincible force like that of the Japanese. Our support of the octogenarian Kiamil Pasha, proclaimed to the world by royal message and otherwise, and marking our disapproval of Young Turkish Ministers, is a case in point. It illustrates the fact that obstacles to constitutional reforms present themselves from without, as well as from within. We have seen that those from within have proved themselves in any case overwhelming.

* * * * * *

In order to apply the logic of these reflections to Armenia, it is necessary to find the path towards actual European control, whether by all the Powers or one.

The forms which concerted control may take is a subject of interest; and it has been usual in works of this kind to dwell upon them. They may be studied in the papers of the British Armenia Committee,[1] 'The Balkan Question,'[2] or the works of Sir Edwin Pears and the Duke

[1] 41 Tothill Street, Westminster, S.W. [2] Villari.

of Argyll. In our view, however, the form of control is immaterial. It may be exercised by a Governor, a Council, or by 'adjoints' working, like British officials in Egypt, through Turkish figure-heads. The essential is that the man in real authority should be a European subject, responsible to a European Government or Governments alone, looking to the Sublime Porte neither for appointment, tenure of office, nor pension. The rest—the foreign force required, the organisations of councils and courts, the division between the Powers of spheres (whether of departments or of localities), the methods of administration as to order, justice, and public works—all these are subsidiary to the essential condition; and to discuss them here is to deflect attention from the main point. If the Powers elect to share the work, its elaboration may well be left, uncriticised by the public, to the able men (such as the first dragoman of the British Embassy) to whom it was entrusted in the spring of 1913; the public is only concerned with the fundamental realities essential to reform.

* * * * * *

On a fine evening in September I took a drive from Erivan, the Russian town near Ararat, to see the Armenian villages in the Araxes Valley. The plain, that would be arid

ARMENIANS IN TURKEY

The quilts in foreground cover the unfinished grave of a peasant killed by Kurds.

ARMENIANS UNDER RUSSIAN RULE

waste without irrigation, has here come to look like the rich land one sees in Belgium from the Berlin express, small farms intersected with cypress-like Lombardy poplars, but here growing vines, rice, and cotton. The presence of orchards —mulberry or peach—is denoted by high mud-walls along the road. As we moved farther the walls became continuous, and ripe apricots and quinces leaned over them. Watercourses lined our route on each side, feeding the roots of a double row of poplars. At intervals the wall was pierced by the windows of the farmer's house, flat-roofed, and at this season surmounted by stacks of corn. Old-fashioned mud-dwellings were yielding here and there to new fronts of stone, finely dressed. Big doorways at the side gave a glimpse of yards and verandahs, wellheads, great earthern jars, and farther on the orchard, with the raised wooden sleeping-platforms, used in the hot Araxes Valley. In time the holdings became so thick as to give the effect of a continuous village, an unending community of picturesque market-gardeners—every man happy under his vine and his fig-tree.

As we travelled southward, and the sun sank westward, Ararat, flanked with sunset colour, dominated the world below. Ararat is higher than Mont Blanc, and standing alone it towers uniquely. Yet there is something specially

restful about its broad shoulders of perpetual snow. With the soaring quality of Fuji it combines a sense of holding, up there, a place of repose:

'The high still dell
Where the Muses dwell,
Fairest of all things fair.

In the shadow of the great mountain winnowers were using the last daylight on the green; a man was washing a horse after the burning day, standing shoulder-deep in the stream; buffaloes walked sedately home from their bath, shining like black velvet. The day's work was ending, and we now kept passing family groups sitting at the doorway. Here a boy was playing with a tame hawk; there a father, in most un-English fashion, held in his arms the baby.

The houses became continuous and shops appeared, wine-presses, forges, agricultural machines, Russian gendarmes gossiping outside the inn, wagon-builders and copper-pot makers. The slanting sun displayed a kaleidoscope of industry, not primitive and not capitalist—human economy at its most picturesque stage of development.

We halted to see the village priest, whose son was a student at St. Petersburg University. As we sat in his balcony, the hum of village movement arose above the gathering stillness

ARMENIAN REFUGEES FROM TURKEY ARRIVED IN RUSSIA

of nature, and we remarked on the prosperity of the priest's flock. He agreed; but there was a blot upon it—refugees from Turkey constantly arriving in rags, their property abandoned, driven out by violence and often by brutal violation, even of the very young. Russia was to them a Godsend, though beggary was the price of escape from worse evil.

To the right of Ararat stretched the line of hills which forms the present Russo-Turkish frontier. Upon this horizon the sun set. It was a memorable combination—the eternal snow one associates with the North framed with the glowing brilliance of the Southern sun. Byron was within the mark when he wrote of that sun:

> 'Not as in Northern climes obscurely bright,
> But one unclouded blaze of living light.'

There is something more than that. Those who have watched the white flames of a smelting furnace, and still more those who have climbed to its rim on a dark night, can picture something of the effulgence that streamed up from behind that blackening line of mountains—an effulgence quite correctly described as 'molten.' Hidden now from our view, it still bathed the hills from which these refugees had fled—that noble upland given over to misery and waste.

* * * * * *

Why has the tide of civilisation paused at that particular line of hills ? The frontiers of Turkey on the European side were easily held against the small Balkan States whose territory adjoined them, till those states became powerful by combination, but here the defence is obviously powerless. The fortifications of Erzerum itself have twice been in the hands of Turkey's great neighbour. Yet for thirty-five years the Russian armies have been as if paralysed. Forces even greater than they have said, 'Hands off that frontier, defenceless though it is.'

We are face to face with the Cyprus Convention and the Berlin Treaty, which specify that this Turkish frontier is guaranteed by the Powers, and by England in particular. Those documents, till you visit the spot, seem abstract and intangible embodiments of justice. Here they are concrete enough to the peasant escaping penniless through the hills ; to the Armenian priest in Russia, trying to find him bread ; to the Russian prefect, dealing with brigands who can always escape into a lawless country. These diplomatic instruments, usually cited as vague landmarks in past history, are here playing a tragically definite part.

Again and again the embassies at Pera have debated schemes for ending that absurdity. The Chancelleries recognised that the Balkan

settlement offered a chance to put pressure on the Sublime Porte. They knew that to leave the Armenians to despair was to court the certainty of risings, 'excesses,' and interventions, which would endanger European peace.

* * * * * *

It is to be hoped that control by the Concert will be achieved. But ultimate success will remain in doubt for many years, whatever compact between the Porte and the Powers may be made. And the obstacles thrown in the way of progress, whether by the Turks or by one of the Powers, will be greater if each knows that no penalty will follow. They will be less if there is a prospect of alternative action by a single Power, in the event of failure by the Concert. We are thus driven to consider what that alternative should be.

If, in course of time, concerted control proves to be unworkable, the duty of Europe is equally clear. It is to entrust reform to that Power which is most ready to establish it.

It is now evident that the question to be faced, and which alone admits of doubt, is the ancient question: Ought Europe to grant a mandate to Russia to superintend reform in Armenia?

* * * * * *

The fact that this course of events has been hitherto precluded by the action of the Concert

needs, at this point, therefore, some further examination.

The arguments used in opposition to Russia affect the interests of Great Britain, of the Powers of Turkey, and of the peoples of Armenia.

1. (*a*) The interests of Great Britain have been the chief factor, and among them the strategic menace of Russian advance has been most influential. It was associated with four geographical points, lying upon the route to India—the Dardanelles, the Cilician coast, the Persian Gulf, and the Indian frontier.

In regard to the first two of these, we have noted the change of expert opinion. It suffices here to cite Sir Valentine Chirol. When describing the change in British pro-Turkish policy,[1] he speaks of the British occupation of Egypt as having made the question of Constantinople 'no longer so serious.'

As to the Persian Gulf, an epigrammatic writer says 'Diarbekir controls the Gulf.' But, granting the assumption, why Diarbekir? A frontier south of that town, bringing Russia to the Mesopotamian plains, would no doubt give her a strategic *point d'appui*. But the boundary of true Armenia is that of the tableland, and its frontier would be in the lofty hills north of Diarbekir, where a frontier tenable also from the

[1] Vide *The Balkan Question*.

south would be found. Russia would ask in vain for German consent to a frontier which would imperil the Bagdad Railway.

There remains the question of Seistan and Quetta. The same writer says 'Persia would be lost.' The argument was good, but time has removed it. The strategic Persian problem has receded far from the Turco-Persian frontier. North Persia is lost already. The vision of Russia knocking at the Persian door near Urmi from the Turkish side is reversed; Russian troops are in Tabriz, and centred upon the Turkish frontier at Khoi.

(*b*) The Persian argument was advanced in respect of trade. Englishmen developed the trade route from Trebizond to Tabriz, to avoid the Russian custom-house. If Russia held Erzerum, and included Armenia in her protective system, certainly our trade would suffer. But occupation is not necessarily protection. Russia already occupies Azerbaijan, but the Russian tariff has not followed, and British trade has grown with the security she has provided on the roads. The same might follow for the trade in Turkey. In any case, the Persian trade will not now be saved by keeping Russia out of Turkey.

But let the trade argument be considered further. The British goods imported by this

route have lately reached some £600,000. Suppose a net profit of £200,000. Will it seriously be urged that a country doing a foreign trade of over £1,000,000,000 cannot afford to risk a partial loss of such an item, but must on account of it prevent the liberation of provinces containing 3,000,000 people? The commercial interest concerned is not even that of England as a whole (which may gain by the development of Turkey), but that of a section of traders depending on the peculiar circumstances of a limited, though comparatively free-trade, market. Their attitude is perfectly natural; but for a Government to support it savours of pinchbeck short-sightedness. With the desire to preserve the open door, if it can be combined with development and progress, all Englishmen must sympathise; but the open door is not promoted by our present policy. The way towards it would surely lie, neither in past anti-Russian, nor present pro-Russian policy, but in co-operation with Powers which have the same object, for instance, Germany, for the maintenance of open markets, in Persia as in China.

(*c*) Our motive in the past has been, also, a general opinion that the giant of the North would prove too big and too greedy. I recollect venturing the question of friendship with Russia in 1897 to Sir Richard Temple, then well-known

as a great authority on India. His indignant reply was typical of the then prevalent feeling. Russia is now growing faster than ever; but the Foreign Office is helping to promote a flow of capital from England which is making Russia's growth faster still. In regard to greed, Turkish dominions have been seized by England, France, Austria, and Italy since any of her territory fell to Russia.

2. It has been held that other Powers, in addition to ourselves, required to oppose Russia. English writers have invoked the fears of Germany, and while admitting the desire of France to possess Syria, have dwelt on the dangers to all the Powers of a scramble for Turkish lands. They have coined the solemn formula, 'Europe requires the territorial integrity of Turkey.' It is to be noted, by the way, that this formula was equally applied to Turkey in Europe, but was readily thrown over at the call of the Balkan States.

The arrival of Germany on the Turkish scene has of course constituted a great factor in modern politics. Its bearing on the Armenian question is favourable to our case. It means that a Russian Armenia would not, as we have seen, threaten the Gulf, because Russia would have to reckon with Germany, and content herself with something less than the whole of the six Armenian vilayets, halting at a frontier in the hills, and

renouncing part of the vilayets of Diarbekir and Van. It means, again, that the Armenians of Cilicia (the old kingdom of 'Little Armenia') are coming under a régime of order through the progress of German exploitation. The practical question is that of the line at which the spheres of Germany and Russia would be divided. It is no doubt with a view to strengthening her case for this purpose, that the German Consulate has become active at Van, and that a new Consulate has been opened at Erzerum.

Germany is, let it be granted, a supporter at present of the *status quo*. She is yearly improving her claims and position, and she gains by delay. But Russia has the power to force the pace. Germany's drag upon her lies in the threat of direct action on European frontiers. England used a somewhat similar lever when she attacked Russia in the Crimea. But Russia has continuous access to the frontier in question. Neither we nor Germany have this. Consequently, we cannot stop her progress in Persia, nor can Germany do so in Turkey, except indirectly. Her lines of communication are unbroken. She is on the spot and confronts us with the *fait accompli*. She has the whip hand, and may seize a moment when Germany is hampered. In practice, if Russia were no longer debarred from action, diplomatic con-

venience would lead to a Russo-German agreement upon spheres of influence, as it led to the Russo-British agreement in Persia. With the allotment of spheres the pressure on Turkey towards reform would become effective. Public order would become the interest both of the controlling Government and the controlled, as it did in North-west Persia.

3. The vague argument against change is used also, 'It would be the end of Turkey.' But this is untrue. A barbaric state is less vulnerable and sensitive than a civilised power. Turkey was not destroyed when Russia took, and kept, Kars. She was not 'ended' even by the loss of all Turkey in Europe. She is, on the contrary, strengthened by the transference of non-Turkish and disordered provinces. Nor would consolidation (Mr. Disraeli's phrase) by the loss of the Armenian vilayets contribute a strategic change either to her or to the Powers. Albania and Macedonia are known to have cost her much more than they paid into her Treasury. They brought recruits but they involved additional army corps. Armenia corresponds to Albania.

4. At this point 'anti-Russians' fall back on the wishes of the populations concerned. It would, they say, be unfair to the Mohammedans. These certainly deserve every consideration. In

part their objection would be the same as against the alternative—namely, government by the Concert, which would destroy their ascendency. But of Russia they have actual experience, through their co-religionists in the Caucasus. That museum of small races is largely composed of Moslems — Tartars, Persians, Lesgians, Circassians, and many other races. Russia is, of course, a great Mohammedan state, in which Mohammedans, from Petersburg to the Araxes, live, not (as in the British Moslem territories) as a subject people, but as equals of the Russians in political status. Nowhere have they such high social economic position.

The question affects chiefly, in this case, the Kurds. A common subject of conversation in Turkey is the latest Kurd movement towards unity, and particularly the Russian policy which is assumed to be behind it. One must, of course, distinguish between the assumed activity of the Muscovite in Turkey and his action in Persia, where alone it is ascertainable. In the latter it would appear similar to some British methods of dealing with frontier tribes. The problem is always that of inducing fighting men to be satisfied with a peaceable life, while flattering their vanity and their warlike tastes. The chief is therefore entertained by some high official; he is invited to undertake the tasks of a military

police ; and he is given a subsidy so long as he behaves himself. If imitation be flattery, the Czar's government has flattered us by applying this system to the notorious Ismail Agha (better known as Simko), to Abdul Rezak of Jezireh, (of the great Bedr Khan clan), and to other great chiefs who lately visited the Viceroy of the Caucasus at Tiflis. Simko spoke to us of the vice-governor of the Caucasus as 'my friend.' The present aim of Russia's policy among the Kurds is, no doubt, in part to prevent them from making terms with the Turks, or, on the other hand, with the Christians, and to keep up the excuse for possible intervention. Austria's efforts among the Albanians before 1912 were similar. One need not be blind to the unpleasant necessities of Powers so situated, in order to conclude that they are justified. It is more to the point to consider how the Kurds would be affected as a whole by an occupation. Their villages, only just across the Russian frontier, are noticeably richer and less ragged. Under settled rule, ceasing to live by theft, they become agriculturalists.

5. The Russian solution has hitherto been ignored by Armenophil Committees, owing to the doubt whether Armenians desire it, and to the suspicion of Russia felt by those who study her methods in Russia proper, and (very

naturally) by Jews. The reader will have formed an impression from a previous chapter upon the state of the Armenians in Russia. When in Turkey we made it a prime object to learn the opinion of various classes and parties. On all hands we found that a great change of view has taken place, partly no doubt from despair of the Concert. It is recognised that the appeal of Armenians to England, futile as it proved, was specially disastrous in a form which alienated Russia. But also the Russian attitude has completely altered. A return to the old Russia is felt to be unthinkable.

'Russification' has been tried and discarded as a policy for the Caucasus and Armenia, with exceptional completeness. Galitzin's method, contrasted now with the successful régime of Varantzoff-Dashkoff, has shown the inefficiency of the former. Under Galitzin upper-class Armenians, formerly led by equal treatment into such 'loyalty' that they forgot their language and almost their race, learnt, by the sole fact of exclusion from public office, that they had a cause to defend. The new Viceroy's reports point triumphantly to the renewal of that loyalty which Russia seeks.

Armenian fears run as follows :

(*a*) National autonomy for Turkish Armenia would, under Russia, be impossible.

(*Answer*) It is not possible in Turkish Armenia in any case. The Powers would not grant it, and the population is too divided to permit of success.

(*b*) Russian prestige and culture weaken the national feeling of the Armenian *bourgeoisie*. Snobbery demoralises the rich, and place-hunting the poor; while Russian art, drama and literature attract the educated. Armenian millionaires grow rich through oil-fields or mines, forget their language and despise their Church and peasantry. They pose as Russians so successfully that English governesses have sometimes taken service with them in England in the belief that they were Russian, though fully acquainted already with Armenian families in the Caucasus.

(*Answer*) This is serious, but it may be doubted whether the influence of plutocrats of this kind would be of much gain to the Armenians or to any other nation.

It is also a fact that some of the Russophobe Armenians, e.g. army officers, are noted for attachment and generosity to the national Church.

(*c*) Russian rule is not only unnational but unequal. Official posts are given to Russians.

(*Answer*) This is unfair, but it contradicts the last argument, for the effect is to create

national sentiment. An Armenian in public office, for instance, was brought up, he told me, to think himself Russian ; but when relatives of his were excluded from promotion under the Galitzin régime, he became a keen Armenian.

All this raises the question, What is the exact value of nationalism ?—a subject too great to be examined here. But may it not be granted that its prime value is that of a stimulant to energy—a means to an end ? Variety of type is of first-rate importance to the world. Small nations produce much more of it than if they were uniform aggregates like the 100,000,000 Russians. But for these purposes national feeling can exist without political autonomy, and is present among Armenians under Russian rule. Political subjection is tolerable unless misrule is so bad that energies are diverted from culture to bitter agitation. That is the test which condemns the treatment of Poland.

* * * * * *

This is written with no inclination to slur over the evils of Russian rule, but with recent and personal observation of them. To correct any undue leaning in that direction, born of the desire to find a liberator for Armenia, we followed our visit to Armenia by a stay in Poland. The

vindictive repression of Russian Liberals and the persecution of Jews are features of most Russian towns. In Warsaw they are supplemented by the deliberate and brutal repression of national feelings and local rights. Genuine provincial councils are non-existent. The council of a city of 750,000 inhabitants (excluding the enormous garrison) is a make-believe in the hands of a Russian salaried 'mayor.' Polish business men, concerned in modern enterprises, may not stay the night at great manufacturing centres, like Lodz, without a passport. Government officials, even of common labour grade, like the doorkeepers at the old Polish palaces, are Russian. Polish railways are taken over by the State, and at once their railwaymen are replaced by Russians. In recent times suspected persons have disappeared to Siberia without trial. The repression is carried out by all possible means, not only economic and political, but also psychological. Filling the great square of Warsaw, the chief meeting-place of the Polish nation, a huge and splendid and incongruous Russian cathedral has been planted. As I write, its magnificent bells, eclipsing all the din of a great modern city, are reminding every Pole of his subjection to an alien and less advanced state. It is certainly with no blindness to the inefficient cruelty of the Russian bureaucrats that we record,

in spite of it, our confirmed opinion that a Russian occupation of Armenia would be unquestionably to the good. Polish conditions produce evils which would not be found there. Even if they were possible, they would be preferable to the present state of Turkish Armenia. You can find, no doubt, among the Armenian *intelligenzia* men who hold that though Russia would preserve the lives of the people, she would injure the soul of the nation. But these are few. Even if their opinion were general, we must be careful to remember two things: first, that the wishes of the humbler class in Armenia—peasants and workmen—are not always reflected by those classes which are vocal in Europe; second, that our standard differs somewhat from theirs. To them the interest of a nation or a Church may justify the loss of individuals. Our concern is with security of life, and property, and domestic honour.

Ask yourself, here in Warsaw—Do the dangers of Russian rule make you hesitate to risk them in Armenia? Cast a glance at Turkish Armenia, and then at the culture, wealth and order which, after all, make life for the Armenian in Russia not so different from that of most people in Western Europe, and you see that the comparison is absurd.

* * * * * *

The great nations are preoccupied with their own proposals for political and social progress, and rightly so. But judged by the test of human lives saved and fundamental human rights secured, there is no question, of all those which occupy the Governments of the great States, more weighty than that of Armenia.

* * * * * *

For the citizens of the great Powers a feasible policy, should control by the Concert fail, is available. Even 'Turcophils' admit that intervention and European control are required. That is a conviction all the more weighty because it is combined with a bias in favour of the Turks. To bring about that intervention, through the constitutional action of Europe, if not by this method then by the other, is one of the first tasks of diplomacy, one of the first duties of civilisation.

ARMENIAN HISTORY,

CULTURE AND CHARACTERISTICS

BY

ARAM RAFFI

CHAPTER I

ARMENIA : HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

To the traveller in Armenia the most arresting things are the ruins of ancient palaces, fortresses, and monasteries ; Ani, for instance, the ancient capital, with its many castles and its hundred and one churches. Something of them still remains to tell the tale of their past glories. For a long time Mount Ararat, assuming a more and more imposing character, is in sight. The Araxes, the symbol of the Armenian nation, is still the boundary.

Other parts of the world can boast of even greater ruins, but the nations whose civilisation they typify have long since passed away, whereas the Armenian race still exists although stripped of its glory.

Buried under heaps of earth, a pillar or dome, a house or wall, however dilapidated, yet remains to give a feeling of the past. Shakespeare must have meant Armenia when he said :

> 'Tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
> Sermons in stones . . .'

History tells us that all these bare hills and plains were once covered with forest, and that a rich cultivation formerly existed here.

The Greek and Roman historians describe Armenia as a flourishing and prosperous land, so productive that it supplied other nations with corn, wine, butter, and other commodities. From the nature of the country, it was possible to carry on extensive stock-rearing. The slopes of the mountains afforded rich pasture for cattle and horses, of breeds which had a high reputation among the ancients. The Tigris and the Euphrates formed excellent lines of communication with Mesopotamia and the Persian Gulf. The greater part of the Indian trade passed through Armenia to Pontus.

With the exception of Tigranes the Great, Armenia can boast of no famous conquerors, like Xerxes and Alexander; indeed, she would have gained no advantage from conquest, as her people were fully occupied in cultivating their own soil.

The varieties of climate within her borders had the effect of rendering her inhabitants adaptable to all conditions. Anyone leaving the shores of the Black Sea in April and travelling rapidly south may, in one week, experience the delights and discomforts of three seasons of the year. On the shores of the Black Sea he

leaves spring at her loveliest; on the plateau of Erzerum he meets stark cold winter; in Mesopotamia he finds harvest approaching, and sees the farmer busying himself with artificial irrigation to counteract the effects of the scorching heat. Winter in Armenia lasts from October to May, spring and harvest occupy a month each, and the change to summer is very rapid.

To give a brief sketch of Armenia and its people is to summarise a tragedy, to outline the story of a most unhappy nation, whose martyrdom has endured for centuries; of a country attacked by the denizens of Asia, Africa, and Europe, which has suffered the manifold horrors that belong to barbarous ages, which has fallen, but still exists, though crushed, clinging to the soil of its ancestors, though every inch of that soil is stained with blood.

The vast country known as Armenia has varied in extent at different epochs. Armenia proper was formerly bounded on the north by Georgia (Iberia) and Colchis (Mingrelia), on the east by the Caspian Sea and Persia, on the south by Mesopotamia and Assyria, and on the west by Asia Minor; the portion to the east of the Euphrates comprised Greater Armenia, that on the west of that river being named Lesser Armenia. It lies partly between the mountains,

Amanus and the Black Sea. In ancient times Armenia was washed by the Mediterranean, Caspian and Black Seas, and occupied all the region of Western Asia situated between the southern boundary of the Caucasian Mountains and Mesopotamia.

Armenia does not now exist politically, but is divided into three unequal parts : the northern (including the district of Kars and Erivan) belongs to Russia, the south-east (the province of Azerbaijan) to Persia, and the west (including Erzerum and Diarbekir) to Turkey. The area of this extensive territory is 140,000 square miles. The greater portion lies at an altitude above the sea varying from 3,000 to 8,000 feet. In the centre of this immense circle of table-land rises Mount Ararat, the meeting-point of the three divisions. The main waters of the Euphrates, Tigris, Kura, and Araxes spring from the heights of Armenia. The valley of the Araxes is the traditional site of the Garden of Eden. This country is the Scriptural 'Minni.' From the cuneiform inscription of Van, for the most part deciphered and translated, we learn that, from the ninth century B.C., the country was called Urardou, and its inhabitants Khalds (not Khaldeans). Their history and the royal nomenclature suddenly ceases in 585 B.C. The name 'Armenia' first appears in the fifth century

(Herod.), and its inhabitants are always called 'Armenians' by the most ancient of other nations—the Assyrians, Persians, and Greeks—the Georgians, however, called them 'Somekhi.' On the other hand their own name for themselves is 'Hai' and for their country 'Hayastan,' being the eponym founded on 'Haik,' son of Torgom, great-grandson of Japheth, son of Noah, whose Ark, according to Biblical tradition, rested on the mountain of Ararat. Mount Ararat has always been called by the Armenians 'Massis.' But what is noteworthy, the valley of the Araxes, extending southwards to this mountain, has always been known to them as 'Airaratian Dasht' (Plain of Airarat). This plain has been selected by Armenian tradition as the site of Paradise.

Passing over the legends of the eponymous ancestors of the Armenians, we may merely say that those legends are probably unique in the primeval histories of mankind, as they insist upon purity of family life. They deal with a long list of thirty Armenian and thirty Syrian monarchs, headed by Semiramis, who evidently were continually at war amongst themselves.

The authentic history of Armenia begins in the sixth century B.C. We then find Tigranes I, King of Armenia, maintaining his independence even against Cyrus the Great; but like the suc-

cessor of Cyrus, the successor of Tigranes (Vahe), succumbed to Alexander the Great (328 B.C.). When the powerful Macedonian king, before his death, divided his first Asiatic empire among his generals and successors, Armenia was bequeathed to the Seleucidae, who governed it until the Parthians appeared, conquered the Syrians (190 B.C.) and established themselves as masters of a great portion of the Seleucian dominions. About 150 B.C. the great Parthian king, Arshak (Arsaces VI or Mithridates I) placed upon the throne of Armenia his brother Vagarshak, afterwards founder of one of the greatest branches of the Arshakuni (Arsacid) dynasty, whose sway began about the time when Greece was finally subjugated, and ended (A.D. 428) about half a century before the suppression of the Western Roman Empire. The most celebrated king of this dynasty was Tigranes II (90–55 B.C.), in whose reign Armenia attained the height of her power, and who became the most formidable monarch in Asia. He had some talent, great courage, and an ambition to possess the empire of all Asia. He was successful in wars against the Asiatic Greeks, compelled all the neighbouring provinces and tribes to acknowledge him as their sovereign, and obtained from the monarchs of Persia the title of 'King of Kings.' In his time Armenia became more prominent than ever before as a

distinct geographical unit, and the consequent growth of its population soon engendered that consciousness of national unity which, in spite of political ups and downs, has enabled the nation, as a nation, to survive many centuries of dismemberment, impoverishment, massacre, and attempts at utter extermination. The Syrians, tired of the eternal internecine quarrels of the Seleucidae, invited Tigranes II to drive out Antiochus Pius and take possession of their country, thus extending his dominions from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean. Tigranes governed Syria for eighteen years, till it was reduced to the status of a Roman province by the arms of Pompey. This man, whom Plutarch and other writers designated 'Tigranes the Great,' was endowed 'with that power which has wrested Asia from the Parthians, which carries Grecian colonies into Media, subdues Syria and Palestine,'[1] 'made the Republic of Rome tremble before the prowess of his arms,'[2] and 'gave laws to the Arabians called Semites.'[3]

Through his connection with his father-in-law, Mithridates the Great, King of Pontus, Tigranes found himself involved against Rome in the campaign of Lucullus (69 B.C.). Near the town of Tigranakert he led 360,000 men against the comparatively small Roman force, so that

[1] *Letter of Lucullus.* [2] Cicero. [3] Rollin.

Lucullus perceived the urgent necessity of concentrating his men to the best advantage. Antiochus, the philosopher, declares that the sun never saw such a battle; Livy, that with such inferior numbers the Romans never engaged such a multitude; and Strabo, that the Romans laughed at the notion of using weapons against such an enemy. But Tigranes paid the penalty of carelessness, engendered by the prospect of an easy victory. 'If these men,' he said, on first seeing the Romans, 'come as ambassadors, their number is sufficient; but if they come as enemies they make but a very indifferent appearance.' The Armenians received the onslaught of the Romans almost unprepared, and their confusion was increased by the inability of the trumpeters to sound a retreat.

It was in vain that Tigranes endeavoured to stir up the Parthians and neighbouring princes against Lucullus. 'The Romans,' he said (according to Sallust in the fourth book of his history), 'are at war with all mankind. They pillage kingdoms, sell their inhabitants as slaves, plunder the temples of gods, acknowledging no other law than their own arbitrary will and pleasure.'

Armenia was reduced to its former limits at the conclusion of a peace (66 B.C.) with Pompey, who succeeded Lucullus as commander of the

Roman forces. After this, the Armenians were almost always at war with the Romans through hatred, and with the Parthians through jealousy.[1] Between the rival Roman and Persian Empires, Armenia, which lay on the direct road to Parthia, regained, but with difficulty maintained, its independence. Armenian princes of the same dynasty continued to rule until the Arsacidae were driven from the Persian throne by Sassanid (Artashir).

The lofty mountains and deep valleys, of which the country is mainly composed, afforded places of safety to the vassals of the crown, who, one by one, threw off their allegiance and made themselves sovereigns on their own account. The government thus became an oligarchy under the form of a monarchy, and the significance of the title of 'king' during the next few centuries must not be over-estimated.

Armenia is celebrated in ecclesiastical history as the first state to embrace Christianity. In the year 274 (A.D.) the Armenian king, Tiridates, was baptised by St. Gregory the Illuminator, and this circumstance, being in the eyes of his subjects incontrovertible proof of the truth and sanctity of the new doctrine, they became Christians *en masse*. The introduction of Christianity reinvigorated the national life, and gave a great impulse to literary activity.

[1] Tacitus, *Annals*, Book II, ch. 56.

Under the Emperor Theodosius, Armenia was unceremoniously divided by treaty between the two great powers. The religion of the inhabitants attracted them towards the Roman half, but on seeing the Christian emigrations, the Persians, with philosophic toleration or interested indifference, appointed a native Christian prince to reign over their portion of the spoil, which thenceforward seems to have been by far the better governed. In fact, it was in the Persian half of Armenia, and by a Christian prince, who ruled under the protection of a heathen king, that the most important benefits of religion and civilisation were conferred upon the people.

Situated, in the first or classical period of its history, between the Persians and the Greek Empire, and in the second period—the first half-millennium of the Christian era—between the Persians and the Roman Empire, the Armenians now stood in the third or Arabian period (from the sixth to the eleventh century A.D.), which is the true mediæval period of history, between Persia, ruled by Saracen conquerors, in all the fervour of recent conversion, and the Eastern, now the Byzantine, Empire. Such was the environment in which the development of their nationality began, contemporaneously with that of the other

nationalities of Europe. This Armenian development was signalised by that elementary consolidation of the people due to the separation of the Armenian from the Greek Church. Marking their steps with fire and sword, the Arabs proved more formidable than the Macedonians, the Romans, or the Persians; in the year 637 they suddenly appeared upon the scene and wrested Armenia from her oppressors only to subject her to a still more odious bondage. They set out to attempt the conquest of the Eastern world in the name of Allah and Mohammed his prophet.

During the ninth century the Caliphs re-established a portion of the ancient empire of the Arsacidae under the Armenian prince Ashod. The capital of this kingdom was Ani, known as the city of a thousand and one churches; the finest and most characteristic specimens of true Armenian architecture are to be found in this city, ruined in 1064, where reigned for nearly two hundred years the dynasty of Ashod. In the eleventh century the Greek Emperors succeeded, by treachery, in subjugating Armenia, but not the Armenians. Their national development continued; a new monarchical consolidation was added to that which owed its first beginnings to Christianity. Ruben, a relative of the last king of the Bagratouni dynasty (A.D. 885–1045),

and founder of the Rubenian dynasty, retired to the north of Cilicia, and founded (1080) in the shelter of the Taurus mountains a small principality, which gradually extended its boundaries to the Mediterranean. It became known as the Kingdom of Lesser Armenia, and maintained itself as the last bulwark of Christianity in the East till 1375. Armenia was thus still independent, though reduced in power, at the time of her second literary epoch (the twelfth and thirteenth centuries) known as the 'Silver Age.' That epoch produced many eminent writers of various kinds.

Armenia nobly did her duty to Europe at the time of the Crusades, and it was through her assistance that the Crusaders were enabled to reach Antioch as promptly as they did.[1] By way of recompense for her services, the Pope and the Emperor of Germany raised the Armenian prince Leon to the dignity of a sovereign, and bestowed upon him and his successors the title of 'king.' When the ardour of the Crusaders abated, however, the Armenians, deprived of the assistance of the Western Christians, were unable

[1] Pope Gregory XIII, in a Bull published in 1384, says: 'No nation and no people were so prompt or so full of zeal as the Armenians to lend their aid, whether it was in men, in horses, in provisions, or in counsel; with all their forces and with the greatest gallantry and fidelity, they came to the aid of the Christians in their holy wars.'

to resist the encroachments of the Mussulmans. Their kings were driven from the throne, and the last Armenian king, Leon VI, of the family of de Lusignan (of Cyprus), was for some time imprisoned by the Mamelukes of Egypt. In 1375 he was freed from his captivity by John of Castile, king of Spain, and after his death, in 1393, the name of Armenia was blotted out of history.

For five hundred years the annals of the Armenians—crushed beneath the Persian yoke or struck down by the sabres of the Turks—contain no memorable events, for the history of the first Christians subject to Moslem laws is only an uninterrupted record of violence and tyranny.

In glancing at the history of Armenia after she ceased to be a power, we can only summarise briefly the atrocities committed by the Byzantine Emperors and the Seljuk Turks; the subsequent devastations of the Mongols (1206) and the hosts of Tamerlane (1387): and a long conflict between the Ottoman Sultans and Persia for the possession of this once flourishing country; and, lastly, mention how, in 1604, the Persian Shah Abbas laid waste the country and carried off 40,000 of the inhabitants of Armenia to Persia. Two districts of Ispahan were allotted to them. The industrial and commercial spirit of this

colony (denominated New Julfa), improved the condition of the Persian Empire, and the Armenians enjoyed a degree of prosperity superior to that which they had known in their own country. But though political economists may calculate, unmoved, the advantages of such an expatriation, a people is not to be torn up by the roots without a pang ; a people will not quit its native soil without regret, even though subject to a tyranny as destructive as that of the Turks ; the members of a nation will not indifferently abandon the mountains and plains among which their lives have been passed ; they will not leave for ever their ancient temples and the tombs of their fathers. The exiled Armenians clung to their religion with a zeal all the more desperate because it was now all that their patriotism had to cling to. The early adoption of Christianity imbued the race with a strong sense of moral responsibility and the importance of moral principles. Commerce has always been and still is the principal pursuit of the Armenians. Endowed with great bodily strength and a sort of passive courage, the Armenian traders were accustomed to make journeys through remote and dangerous countries. They are, indeed, by land what the Greeks were by sea.

Armenian Colonies

It is easy to trace, in the old contemporary historians, indications that, even at an early period, there were small Armenian colonies in Asia Minor and Phrygia. These colonies followed commercial pursuits and were not completely severed from the mother country, in the population of which their departure made no sensible difference; but the increase in the number of emigrants, after the conversion of the Armenians to Christianity, became a formidable danger, and continues to be so up to the present time: this fact is owing to the circumstances under which the Armenians embraced Christianity. When the Armenians were still pagans, there were two branches of the dynasty, ruling over Armenia and Persia respectively, in close sympathy with one another, not only politically, but also religiously. In the third century, however, the Sassanid dynasty was established in Persia, and in the fourth century Christianity was adopted in Armenia. This caused a break in the cordial relations of many centuries' standing, so that political and religious hatred came to prevail. The Armenians, who, up to that time, jointly with other Asiatic nations, had resisted the domination of the Romans, now severed themselves from the pagan East and

turned their eyes towards the Christian West, hoping to gain assistance in the great religious war that fire-worshipping Persia had begun against Christian Armenia. But Byzantium, far from giving help to the Armenians, sowed sectarian dissensions between them and their neighbours, the Georgians and Afghans, who had hitherto been their allies. The Armenians had to face the powerful enemy alone. Many, who could not endure the sufferings this entailed, left their country. Mohammedan, Tartar, and Arab invasions also increased the flood of emigration. Many of these emigrants went to Greece and distinguished themselves, not only in art, but in war. The first fourteen of Justinian's successors on the Byzantine throne were Armenians; but these rulers were attached to their adopted country, and transplanted many Armenians from their fatherland to different parts of their empire, in order that they might develop the resources of those countries. At the end of the sixth century, the Emperor Maurice, who was an Armenian, brought many emigrants from Armenia to Trachea and formed regiments from among them. In the eighth century Constantine Kopronimos, having taken Erzerum, destroyed the town and transplanted the inhabitants. Another great immigration was organised by Basil II in the tenth century.

These immigrants, besides carrying on agriculture, served as soldiers in the wars against the Bulgarians, Russians, and Hungarians. Some of them settled in Thessaly, Macedonia, and Bulgaria, where, by their industry and abilities, many of them attained high positions in the government.

An Armenian prince, Samuel Derjanetz, originally an immigrant, became King of Bulgaria and distinguished himself in the wars against the Greeks.

After the fall of the Armenian Rubenian dynasty, many Armenians emigrated to Cyprus, Rhodes, and Crete, and thence to many parts of Europe, especially to Italy. In Venice, in the sixteenth century, Armenians were very numerous. The Venetian republic granted them the privilege of setting up shops in the Square of St. Mark's without paying duty. In these shops were sold precious stones of various kinds and fine needlework.

A great stream of immigrants, crossing the Caspians, settled along the banks of the Volga, where, at that time, Tartar Khans held sway.

In time of peace these Armenians occupied themselves with commerce, and in time of war they bore arms in aid of the Tartar chiefs ; but being dissatisfied with the rule of this semi-

barbaric race, they subsequently, in conjunction with the Genovians, who were then ruling in the Crimea, turned their arms against the Tartars with satisfactory results. At this time the Armenians prospered in the Crimea and elsewhere, but, when the Crimea was once more threatened by the Tartars, they again emigrated, one portion of them to Poland, where a flourishing Armenian colony had already existed for some time, and, on account of its services to the State, had been granted home rule by Kazimir III, emperor of Poland (1344). The Armenians of Kamenetz and Ilov had the form of self-government that is known as 'Voit,' consisting of twelve Armenians, elected by the whole colony, who managed affairs according to Armenian law and custom. Armenian was the language used in the law-courts. The law by which home rule was granted to the Armenians is known in legal history as 'the Armenian Statute of Kazimir III.'

Success also attended the band of emigrants who went to Transylvania, where they founded the towns of Gerla and Pashpalov, of which they had entire control, having, like the other detachment, been granted self government.

The large settlement of Armenians in Hungary also found favour with the rulers of the country, many of the settlers distinguishing

themselves by services rendered to the government. The roll of these distinguished men is a long one, extending even to the present time, for many prime ministers and famous diplomats of our own day are Armenians. There was another prosperous Armenian settlement in Roumania.

Armenians and Persia

After the fall of the Bagratuni dynasty, Armenia came under the dominion of the Greeks, who were unable, however, to retain their hold, as the country was subjected to the continual attacks of the Seljukian Tartars. The country was eventually subdued without difficulty by Melikshah, the son of Alpaslan (1086–92). Being a man of kindly disposition, Melikshah treated the Armenians well. After his death, the country was divided among several foreign princes, who were continually waging war on one another, causing great suffering to the people. At that period there were still several independent Armenian princes, each of whom ruled over a principality of his own. As there was no union among these principalities, it was impossible for them to throw off the foreign yoke. It was the aim of the Tartar chiefs to overthrow them, and each was attacked in turn,

with the result that it became the scene of bloodshed and desolation.

The whole country being subjected to them, the Tartar chiefs, in 1254, appointed a governor-general whose exactions were numerous and heavy ; not only were there taxes on all products, but there was a poll-tax on every individual above the age of ten. This state of things continued up to the first half of the fourteenth century, when the country fell into the hands of the Mogul emperors. In 1387 Tamerlane entered Armenia. The fame of this great tyrant had preceded him. People fled before him to the mountains and elsewhere, leaving their property behind them. We will here record only a few of his cruelties. At Sebasta he committed all kinds of atrocities. The women were tied to the tails of horses, which were made to gallop, thus causing the death of the victims. He gathered together all the children of the place in one spot and ordered his horsemen to ride over them, so that they were trampled to death. Four thousand Armenian soldiers, who were defending the fortress, were buried alive. After the death of Tamerlane, Armenia fell into the hands of other tyrants, who committed similar outrages. All these invasions were followed by famine.

Contemporary historians record that, after its subjugation by Tamerlane, the country was a

heap of ruins and the famine was so great that not only did domestic animals, such as cats and dogs, become extinct, through being used as food, but there were even cases of cannibalism (1393). Ultimately the country fell into the hands of the Turks, and it was the scene of continued conflicts between that people and the Persians. The outrages committed by the Turks were so grievous that a large number of Armenians emigrated to Persia. Shah Abbas afforded them hospitality and, in 1603, he advanced on Armenia. After conquering Azerbaijan and Erivan, he heard that Sinan Pasha was leading a Turkish army against him and had reached Kars. Shah Abbas, having almost come to the end of his resources, despaired of being able to cope with the Turkish army; he therefore devised the scheme of transplanting the whole population of Eastern Armenia into Persia. The advantages of this step were twofold; in the first place he left a desert between Persia and Turkey, so that the advance of any enemy would be checked by want of food; and in the second place he saw his way to developing the commerce, manufactures, and arts of his own country, by the aid of the Armenians, who were more skilled in these matters than any other Asiatic nation. He ordered all the Armenians of the place to assemble, on pain of death, and march in front of the

Persian army. Their houses and property were burned.

When they reached the river Araxes, Shah Abbas was informed of the approach of the Turkish general. There was no bridge over the Araxes, so that the host had to cross on wooden rafts. Fearing that the Turks would come up and rescue the Armenians from his hands, Shah Abbas commanded that the whole multitude should be pushed into the water, thus giving an opportunity of escape to those Armenians who were able to swim, and at the same time rendering it impossible for any of them to return to their country, since they stood between the waves and the Persian swords. The course of the river was impeded by the corpses of the children and the old folk.

Only a small fraction of the huge multitude were able to escape. These, amounting to 25,000, were taken to Persia, and Shah Abbas established them near Ispahan, where they founded a city named New Julfa, and conferred many privileges on them and treated them well. He would sometimes let the Armenians who came to the court see a little cross that he wore under his robes, giving them privately to understand that he was a Christian at heart, but dared not yet declare himself publicly for fear of a mutiny in the Army. This was a mere pretence, with

a view to bringing the Armenians into closer touch with their new country. Father Krusinski[1] says:—

'The Armenians are an easy, simple people; they believed every word he said and yielded themselves up to him. Shah Abbas lent them great sums of money out of his treasury without interest. His ministers, narrow-minded men, represented to him that if he had a mind to advance so much money it would be better for his subjects to have the benefit of it than strangers, and, at any rate, he ought to receive interest for it. But Shah Abbas, a prince superior to his ministers as much in judgment as in dignity, explained to them that it was more advisable to reserve the Persians for the war, and not let them degenerate by trading, for which they were in no wise fitted; that they loved expense, and after they had squandered what he gave them, they would go and settle somewhere else, and leave his capital without defence, as had happened to him before. On the contrary, the Armenians were thrifty men, good managers, and being in the middle of his kingdom, he had rather they should be traders than soldiers. With respect to interest, he convinced them that he would receive more than they imagined; that if he put the money, which lay dead in his coffers, into the hands of brokers, to be invested, it would at most but bring him in 15 per cent., whereas the trade, which he was about to enable the Armenians to set up, would produce cent. per cent.'

[1] *The History of the Revolution in Persia*, by Father Krusinski, who lived twenty years in Persia and was employed by the King of France in his negotiations at the Persian Court. Dublin: 1729.

'It was with this view that he exempted them from service in the wars, but permitted them to take arms for their own defence when the Persians failed in giving them necessary assistance.'

The Armenians soon became prosperous in their new home. Not only did they attain great wealth, but the whole commerce and trade of the country was in their hands, and they were the first to establish a foreign trade not only with Turkey and other Asiatic countries, but also with Russia and other European nations. Of this we will speak later.

The wars between the Persians and the Turks with regard to dominion over Eastern Armenia continued, the country being in the hands of each belligerent alternately. The Armenians were not strong enough to stand alone. As they were situated between two important empires, they must be sustained by one or the other, so that they had only to consider which would be the more eligible—whether to make their peace on the best terms they could with the Ottomans, whom they could not trust, or to yield themselves up to Persia, whose government they knew to be infinitely milder than that of the Turks, and with whom they might make the stipulations that were most advantageous to themselves.

In order to protect the Armenians against

the tyranny of his own officers, Shah Abbas appointed one of them, under the name of 'Kalantar,' as the chief of the nation, their representative at the court. This officer was the king's lieutenant at Julfa and had full authority. To gain him greater respect, the king allowed him to have Shatyrs, a sort of sergeants mounted on horseback, whereas other officials rode only asses and mules.[1] In a word Shah Abbas granted the Armenians all the privileges that could contribute to their security and keep the Persians from molesting them. Tavernier and other contemporary historians say that houses in Julfa, built by Armenians, were much better than those in the capital town, Ispahan.

After the death of Shah Abbas, the privileges of the Armenians continued for some time, but, after Shah Hussein came to the throne, the clergy pretended that it was a shameful thing that a Mussulman's head should pay for an infidel's, i.e., in their phrase, a Christian's. On this principle, they got it established, not by law but by custom, in all the provinces, that every Mussulman who killed an Armenian should only be condemned to pay to the family of the murdered man as much corn as an ass could carry.

[1] See Krusinski's *History of the Revolution in Persia.*

The Armenians suffered greatly under Prince Thamas. Seeing themselves driven to the last extremity, they took up arms[1] and cantoned, to the number of 4,000, in the mountains of Kapan, near Tabriz. Prince Thamas must needs oppose them with the few troops he had, but was so completely beaten every time he attacked them that, after several vain attempts, he made overtures of peace.

Both sides carried on the negotiations with sincerity, and the important services rendered by the Armenians against the Turks caused the Prince to realise the great assistance he might have had from this people, if, instead of provoking them by the most crying extortions and indignities, as he did at first, he had behaved with moderation towards them and gained their affection, of which they were themselves anxious to give him proofs.

When the *Afghans* conquered Persia, they were conscious of the value of the Armenia element; they published an edict in Ispahan and all over the kingdom, by which all the different races inhabiting Persia were divided into seven classes. The first rank was assigned to the Afghans themselves as conquerors of Persia; the second rank to the Armenians; Jews composed the sixth class; the seventh

[1] See Krusinski's *History of the Revolution in Persia.*

and lowest class consisted of the native-born Persians, who, as a conquered nation, were treated as slaves.

Father Krusinski, who was then in the capital, says:

'Though the Armenians are Christians, their great numbers, capabilities, and riches induced the Afghans to prefer them to the other nations, and, being persuaded that there were none more interested in supporting their power, since they would be the first victims to the vengeance of the Persians, if the latter should recover their dominion, they granted them great privileges. They published an edict that all lawsuits arising among them should be determined by judges of their own nation. They were also permitted to do justice themselves on those nightly robberies which were common then.'

In those times, the northern and eastern parts of Armenia were constantly attacked by Circassians and other Caucasian mountaineers. Those parts of Armenia were then under feudal independent Persian Khans, and were considered as Persian provinces; but, at the same time, the Armenian inhabitants of some of those provinces, because of their mountainous situation, had for some centuries been independent under their own hereditary princes, who were called Meliks. Each Melik was the owner of his province; he had his own fortress and army, so that, when necessary, he was able to defend

his country. He was tributary to the Khan, but the revolution in Persia and the warfare among Persian princes, prevailing in the eighteenth century, roused the Armenian Meliks to efforts for securing the independence of their country and completely liberating it from the Persian yoke. They made overtures to the Russian court and also invited David Beg, an Armenian general in Georgia, who had made himself famous by his military achievements (1721), to come and fight in his country's cause. David came, with 400 soldiers, and at once gained victories, fighting with this small band against mountaineers. This aroused great enthusiasm, and several other princes joined him, each leading a band of men, making altogether an army of 7,000. David Beg cleared the country of the enemy and built a fortress in Halitzor. Soon after this, the Turks came and attacked him under their general, Hadji Mustapha ; but they were driven back. Mustapha returned with fresh forces and surrounded Halitzor. David was outnumbered. In order to escape defeat, he devised a stratagem : by night he let loose a troop of mares among the horses of the enemy ; whereupon the horses, becoming infuriated, ran hither and thither, causing confusion among the Turks. Taking advantage of this, David Beg made an attack on his foes

and repulsed them. Tahmaz Shah, hearing of the exploits of David, conferred on him the title of 'Prince of Princes' and made him ruler of Siunik; but his reign was very short, lasting only six years; he died in 1728. His successors made great efforts to hold their own, but the country again fell under Turkish rule. There were perpetual conflicts between Persia and Turkey for the possession of that part of Armenia until Nadir Shah gained a final victory and, in 1746, a treaty was made by which it was agreed that Eastern Armenia, together with Erivan and Nakhichevan, should be left to Persia, and the southern part of Armenia to Turkey.

The fortunes of the Armenians have also been involved in other political events which have taken place in Persia. Since the expiration of the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the condition of the Persian-Armenians has been comparatively tolerable; they have only had to endure, in common with the other inhabitants of the country, the hardships incidental to an autocratic government and to the feudalism of a half civilised land, for it is only fair to say that, in their own way, the Persian authorities have endeavoured to treat the Armenians with justice. The Government has never organised massacres, like that of a neighbouring Mussulman state.

In spite of unfavourable circumstances, the Persian-Armenians have always, up to the present time, taken a prominent part, not only in the industry of the country, but also in its politics and government. It was but yesterday that the Armenian, Ephrem, led the Constitutional Army and rendered great services in the establishment of Constitutional Government in Persia. Many foreign ambassadors of Persia have been Armenians. London still remembers Mirza Melkom Khan, Persian Minister at St. James's. He was renowned for his learning, and established the first Persian newspaper that was an exponent of liberal ideas and schemes for the regeneration of Persia. This journal was entitled *Kanoun*, and was printed in London. Hovseph Khan Masehian, the present Persian ambassador in Berlin, is a literary man as well as a diplomatist, and has translated the works of Shakespeare into Armenian.

Relations between the English and the Armenians

An English chronicle gives a circumstantial account of events connected with the earliest relations of Armenia with England. In the spring of 1191, the Armenian king, Leon II, and Richard the Lion-hearted met on the classic

soil of Cyprus at Richard's wedding, where Leon II acted as the chief of the bridegroom's friends (best man). A century and a half later (1362) Armenian horsemen took a prominent part in a tournament at Smithfield, and were specially noticed by the King and Queen. The Record Office of London is rich in documents concerning the relations of England and Armenia.

Leon VI, the last King of the Armenians, came to France and thence to England, for the purpose of mediating between the monarchs then at war. It was before the highest assembly of the realm, held by Richard II at Westminster, that the last King of the Armenians advocated the cause of his country, and that of peace, by showing how 'Holy Christendom was weakened by the destructive war between England and France.' Leon evidently foresaw the usefulness of friendship between England and France, and laboured strenuously at the end of his life in exile to bring about such an understanding in the cause of humanity and civilisation. In a document, dated February 3, 1386, Richard II of England, referring to the ambassadors of 'peace,' consents to appoint representatives, and confesses to 'yielding to the entreaties, prayers, and requests made to us by our Royal cousin, the King of Armenia.' In consequence of this, a Conference to discuss terms of peace was held at Lolinghen,

in France (half-way between Calais and Boulogne), under the Presidency of Leon VI.

The influx of the Armenians into India dates back to 1497, *when they became political stepping stones*. Thanks to their business aptitude, they have shown themselves capable of positions of the highest trust. For three centuries they have shown unbounded loyalty to the British Government in India. It is recorded that they even organised a militia of their own countrymen in 1801 for the benefit of the East India Company. They rendered signal proof of their attachment to the English in 1715, when an important deputation was sent by the Company to the Mogul Court at Delhi. The immediate necessity for a royal *firman* from the Mogul Emperor, granting them certain privileges, was keenly felt by the English, and they considered it advisable to seek the co-operation of an influential Armenian to represent their grievances and make favourable overtures.

From Persia, many Armenians found their way to India, and it is now established that there were Armenians settled in Calcutta before Job Charnoch founded that city in 1690, as inscriptions in Armenian have been found on tombstones prior to that date. The *Englishman* (Calcutta), in its issue of January 31, 1895, advances the theory that, according to these

inscriptions, Calcutta was really founded by Armenians. The first account of the connection of the Armenians in India with the East India Company is found in Volume III. of 'Considerations of Indian Affairs,' by W. Bolts (London: 1782). The Armenians associated themselves with the English in 1688, through their representative, Khojah Phanoos Kalantar, an influential Armenian, who was a native of Julfa. As the result of the negotiations between the Governor and Company of Merchants of London trading to the East Indies and the Armenians in India, a Charter was issued under date June 22, 1688, containing the following provisions :—

'1. That the Armenians shall now, *and at all times hereafter*, share equally with English merchants in all indulgences granted by the Company.

'2. That they shall have free liberty at all times hereafter to pass and repass to and from India, in any of the Company's ships on as advantageous terms as any free man whatsoever.

'3. That they shall have liberty to live in any of the Company's cities or garrisons in India, and to buy and sell lands and houses; that they shall be capable of all civil offices and preferments just as if they were Englishmen; and shall *always* have liberty to exercise their religion.

'Moreover, that any Governor who interferes with these privileges shall be dismissed by the Company.

'4. That they may voyage from any of the Company's

Garrisons to any other places in India, the South Seas, China, or the Manillas, in any ships owned or licensed by the Company, and also have liberty to trade with any places within the limits of the Company's charter upon equal terms with Englishmen.'

As a mark of their esteem for Kalantar, the Court of Directors conferred on him and his descendants in India, the monopoly of trade in 'Garnet' and 'Amethyst' stones.

On the strength of the provisions described above, which have never been questioned or annulled, the Armenians have at all times justly claimed equal privileges with the English in India.

A communication from the Court of Directors to the Deputy and Council of Bombay, dated February 26, 1692, refers to the recruiting of Armenians from Ispahan, the Company being then in great need of soldiers. This document states that Armenians would be desirable soldiers, because they have common interests with the English nation and particularly with the Company.

It also says: 'They are very near to our national and reformed religion as sober, temperate men, and know how to live in health in a hot climate.' It then goes on to state that Kalantar thinks it will not be possible to induce many of the Armenians to enlist, because

of their preference for trade, but he hopes that some might be persuaded to do so. Should this hope be fulfilled, the Armenian soldiers are to receive the same pay as the English, with 40*s.* gratuity, and to have their passage paid from Gombroon to Bombay. Not more than from fifty to sixty are to serve at the same time.

The document concludes with the statement that 'Armenian Christians *are the very best men to be trusted*'; and this is only one among many favourable references to Armenians in the records of the East India Company. In a communication to the Indian Governor from the Directors (1695), it is observed that, if ever the Company should be induced to settle factories in Multan and Sandy 'otherwise than by Armenians, they would infallibly come off with great loss.' In 1715 Khojah Israel Sarhad, an Armenian merchant, accompanied an Englishman named John Surnans on an important mission to the Mogul Court, which was attended with great success. This same Armenian had previously rendered great service to England, having been instrumental (1698) in procuring from Prince Mohammed Azim-us-Shaun the grant of the site on which Calcutta now stands.

During the war with Suraj-ud-Dowlah (1756), in the interval between the tragedy of the Black Hole and the arrival of Clive's army, another

Armenian, Khojah Petrus Aratoon, assisted the Governor of Calcutta, who had taken refuge at Fulton, on the Hoogley, about forty miles from the city, by secretly supplying him with boatloads of provisions during a period of six months. On the occasion of a subsequent visit to his English friends at Fulton, Aratoon witnessed the arrival of the troops from Madras under Clive, who afterwards employed him as confidential agent in his negotiations with Meer Jaffier for the overthrow of Suraj-ud-Dowlah.[1] This gentleman was held in high esteem for his charitable disposition and was regarded as the leader of the Armenian community of Calcutta (1778).

Another distinguished Armenian was Agha Catchick Arrakiel, a merchant of Calcutta.

During the festivities in connection with the recovery of George III, in July 1788, he liberated, at his own expense, all the debtors confined by the Court of Requests, to the number of sixteen—a generous act which cost him, it is said, 3,000 rupees.[2]

The son of this man, Agha Moses, rendered valuable service to the British Government by raising in Calcutta a company of one hundred

[1] For further particulars see Orme's *History of Hindoostan*.

[2] See selections from *Calcutta Gazettes*, 1789–97 (published under sanction of Government of India, 1865).

Armenians (1801) which he kept up at his own expense. By appointment of the Government, he served as commandant of this company when it was despatched to fight against the French in the Deccan. For his loyalty he was presented with a sword by the Governor-General, the Marquess of Wellesley, in a full *levée* at Government House.

Armenians and Russia

The Armenians and the Russians were in relation with one another as far back as the first half of the eleventh century, when Alexander, the great Prince of Kiev, applied to the Armenians for help in his wars against the Poles, promising them many privileges in return. The Armenians accepted his invitation (1060) and afterwards were persuaded to remain in the country. An Armenian settlement was formed in Kiev, the members of which distinguished themselves not only in commerce but in war; and in some cases became Court physicians. In 1659 the Armenians of Persia formed a trading company, whose object was to establish commercial relations between Russia and Persia. In order to procure privileges from Russia, they sent a deputation to the Czar Aleksei Michailowitch, to whom they despatched as a gift a golden throne, studded

with diamonds and amethysts, the work of Armenian artificers. This throne is still preserved and is used on great occasions. A commercial treaty was concluded between Russia and the Company, and many valuable products of India and Persia poured into Russia *via* the Persian Gulf, Ispahan, and the Caspian Sea. Before long Armenian merchants were driving a flourishing trade in Moscow, Novgorod, and St. Petersburg. They sold precious stones, lace, silk, and spices, and exported to Persia furs and metals. An Armenian of the name of Safar Vasilian initiated the manufacture of silk by planting the banks of the Terek with mulberry trees, which supplied food for silkworms. Armenians also established silk factories and taught the art of making silk fabrics. Peter the Great issued a special ukase in the beginning of the eighteenth century, promising protection to Persian-Armenians. He issued another decree, addressed to Petros Apro, a rich Armenian merchant, encouraging Turkish Armenians to come to Russia. This attracted many Armenians to the Russian capital. It was then that the independent Armenian princes of Kharabagh, in view of the unsettled state of Persia, conceived the idea of joining together to cast off the Persian yoke, and form an independent Armenian State under the protection of a

Christian monarch. With this view they sent a secret deputation to Europe in order to gain sympathy and assistance (1706). At the head of this deputation were Israel Ori,[1] a Persian-Armenian, and Bishop Minas.

Israel Ori obtained letters from the Emperor in Vienna for the Shah of Persia and he was furnished with a similar communication at Rome from Pope Clement XI. He went to St. Petersburg and was appointed special envoy of the Czar to the Shah of Persia, travelling to Ispahan with a numerous retinue. All this terrified the Court of Persia, where it was regarded as incredible that an Armenian, a natural-born subject of the king, supported by princes so powerful as the Czar of Moscovy and the other Emperors of Europe, with such a numerous retinue, could have come into Persia without some secret design, especially as it was said of him that he was a descendant of the ancient kings of Armenia and had not renounced his claims to that sovereignty. One or two Europeans, who were jealous of the Armenian,

[1] Israel Ori had already lived a long time in Europe, where he had held high military rank and had acted as diplomatic representative at different European courts. Among other missions, he was sent from the court of Vienna to Constantinople to carry on peace negotiations, as the result of which the treaty of Carlowitz was concluded solely through his agency. He passed into the service of the Czar, attaining the rank of Colonel, and carried on negotiations between the Russians and the Turks to the Czar's satisfaction.

fermented the alarm for their own purposes, giving currency to some predictions that were said to be preserved in certain archives to the effect that the kingdom of Armenia would one day revive under the protection of Muscovites. In order to aggravate the panic, the ambassador's anagram was tacked on to those predictions, it being pointed out that in *Israel Ori* were found the letters *Il sera Roi*, i.e., *He shall be King*. The clergy and the populace were especially excited by these rumours and the Persians were therefore advised not to receive the embassy. But the Shah and his ministers dared not refuse audience to a representative of such powerful monarchs. This deputation gave a new impulse to the hopes of the Armenians, as Ori's message to his fellow-countrymen on his return was that the Armenians of Persia were ready to co-operate in the liberation of their country. Soon after Israel died, without seeing the realisation of his hopes. His work was continued by others. The Meliks of Kharabagh did not cease to treat with the Russian Court, where negotiations were conducted by the Armenian Archbishop Joseph, and Hovhannes Lazarian, a rich and influential Armenian, who continually discussed matters with the ministers of the Russian Court. In the Russian archives there are several memorials addressed to the Czar by Armenians. One was

delivered to Count Sovoroff in 1780.[1] This memorial ends with the following words :—

'If our proposal receives the favour of the Empress, its advantages will be manifold. Armenia will serve as a buffer State against Turkey and Persia. Armenians will gather to their fatherland from all places and the country will be enriched. It will be possible for us always to maintain, in time of peace, from 15,000–20,000 soldiers, and in case of war between Turkey and Persia, more than 60,000. When necessary, Armenia will supply troops to Russia, in case the latter should be involved in a war.'

From this and similar documents, it may be gathered that what the Armenians desired was that Russia should send a small auxiliary force to instruct them in European military art, so as to enable them to re-organise themselves and thus to protect their own country. The policy was one of self-reliance and self-protection. The Russians made several inquiries and gathered information about the Armenians through their own agents. The result of these inquiries was favourable to the Armenians ; the Russian Court, therefore, decided to form an Armenian principality out of Gharabagh and Gharadagh and to give it their support. Prince Pateomkin, commenting on this affair in a communication to Catherine the Great, says :—

[1] *Collection of Acts relating to the History of the Armenian People.* (Moscow : 1838.)

'Your imperial promises will lay the foundation of a new Christian State in Asia. By your desire, I have informed the Armenian Meliks of these promises.'

There are extant two documents entitled: 'Treaty between Russians and Armenians,' one of which, dated 1790 and consisting of nineteen articles, contains interesting details about the contemplated new Armenian State. We cite here a few particulars: Armenians should become subjects of Russia in the same sense as they were subjects of Greece and Persia, that is to say, they should pay tribute to Russia and in time of war should render military assistance.

The king of Armenia should be of the Armenian religion and should be consecrated in Etchmiadzin.

A Russian force, limited in number, under a Russian general, should be permanently stationed in Armenia.

There should always be at the Russian Court a member of the Armenian royal family.

The emblem of Armenia was to be a Noah's Ark, resting on Ararat. The same emblem was to serve as a device for a decoration with three ribbons of three different colours, red, green and blue, which were the colours of the first rainbow after the Flood. Another decoration was devised, to be called after Gregory the Illuminator. The

King's seal was of the following device : the one-headed eagle of the Arsacidae (which was used as the emblem of Armenia before the Armenians embraced Christianity), the two lions of the Rubenian dynasty, and a lamb (the emblem of Christianity).

It was agreed that there should be no slavery in the new State, as slavery had never existed in Armenia.

In the other document (also dated 1790), it was declared that Russia would recognise Armenia as an independent State and that Armenia should have its own ambassador at St. Petersburg. It was also stipulated that, for a period of twenty years, Russia should maintain in Armenia a force consisting of 2,000 cavalry, 2,000 infantry, and 2,000 artillerymen. The Armenians were to pay 60,000 toumans for the maintenance of this army, half of this sum to be paid in gold and silver, the other half in bread, meat, and wine.

These troops were to evacuate Armenia in the course of twenty years, thus : 2,000 after ten years, 2,000 after fifteen years, and the remaining 2,000 after twenty years.

The tribute paid by the Armenians would be reduced in the same proportion, and would finally be entirely remitted. After the cessation of the tribute, as a sign of their subjection to

Russia, the Armenians were to send annually one oz. of pure gold, three horses and one ram.

The document contains many other interesting details; among the rest is the stipulation that, in case of any disagreement between Russia and Armenia, Germany should be asked to act as arbitrator.

When Peter the Great conquered Derbend and Baku, the Georgian King Vakhtank and the Armenian Meliks, with 40,000 troops, marched to join him against the Turks, as they hoped that the Russian monarch would render assistance to their fatherland. But Peter, after occupying Derbend, Baku, and Gilan, suddenly returned to St. Petersburg. This co-operation of the Armenians with Russia enraged the Turks and entailed fresh attacks from them on the Armenians. After the death of Peter the Great, when he was succeeded by Catherine II (1762), the question of Armenian independence again arose. Catherine's policy was to settle Armenians in unoccupied parts of Russia, protecting them there till it became possible to liberate them entirely from Mohammedan rule. By Catherine's persuasion, 15,000 Armenians migrated into Russia from the Crimea. Lands on the banks of the Don were assigned to them, where they built the towns of Nor-Nakhechivan, and Grigoriopol. At that time, these Armenian

settlers were granted special privileges—commercial and other. Among the rest, they were allowed to have their own court of justice, for which the Armenian Archbishop Joseph drew up a code of laws, founded on ancient Armenian legislation. Armenian emigration extended also to other parts of Russia, where the settlers occupied themselves not only in commerce, but in shipbuilding for the navigation of the Caspian Sea, as well as in the manufacture of silk, vine-growing, and the cultivation of rice.

In 1795, Agha Mohammed Khan proclaimed himself King of Persia and advanced on Gharabagh and Georgia, which was then under the protection of Russia, and laid waste the Georgian capital, Tiflis. While advancing against the Armenian Meliks, to punish them for their Russophile tendencies, he was murdered by his chamberlain (1797). When the Russians received news of the invasion of Georgia and Gharabagh, they sent two armies, one to each of these countries. These armies were small in number, but they were greatly augmented by Armenians, who not only fought on the side of the Russians, but also supplied the latter with provisions. Subsequently, there were other wars between Russia and Persia, in which the Russians were entirely victorious. In the last of these wars, from Tiflis, a Russian regiment,

having in its ranks many Armenian volunteers, was sent against Persia under the command of Madatian, an Armenian, and gained some splendid victories, conquering Gharadagh. The main Russian army followed later ; in this army was an Armenian volunteer regiment, headed by the Archbishop Nercess, mounted on horseback, and holding a cross in his hand (1827). During this campaign the Armenians rendered great service to the Russian cause in various ways, more especially as guides, for the Russians were quite unacquainted with the country through which they were marching. This war terminated in a treaty between Russia and Persia containing these two conditions :—

1. That all the territory extending as far as the river Araxes should belong to Russia.

2. *That no obstacle should be raised by the Persian government to the departure of any Armenian who might be desirous of emigrating to Russia* (1828).

The effect of the latter stipulation was the migration into Russia of 40,000 Armenians from Azerbaijan.

In the following year, Russia engaged in war with Turkey and gained some Turkish territory. This resulted in the migration of 90,000 Armenians from Turkish Armenia into the newly conquered lands.

Thus, through her victories over Persia and Turkey, Russia not only gained accessions of territory, but was enabled to develop the resources of her new possessions by planting in them an industrial population.

The new-comers, moreover, having security of life and property, were free to turn their energies to trade and manufactures, whereby they brought about the prosperity of the regions in which they dwelt.

Favourable economic conditions enabled them to turn their attention to learning and the arts. By the ukase of March 21, 1828, the newly acquired lands were called 'the Armenian Provinces,' and to the Russian Royal title was added the phrase, 'King of Armenia.'

The promises with regard to an independent Armenia were, however, forgotten, but even then the Armenians did not give up their hopes of autonomy. A scheme was devised of bringing about an understanding between Armenia and Georgia with regard to forming themselves into a joint kingdom, but this project was never carried into execution. Another hopeless task was undertaken by some rich Armenians of Persia, who formed a company with the object of buying up Russian Armenia with a view to making the provinces of Erivan and Nakhechivan into an independent Armenian principality.

At the head of this movement was a very wealthy man named Hovseph Hovhaness Amar Khan. Through Archbishop Nercess and Prince Lazarian he communicated with the Czar, Nicholas I, offering to pay 500,000 francs annually to Russia if she would consent to the realisation of his scheme. The Czar invited him to come to Russia for the purpose of negotiating (December 1830). Amar Khan started on the journey, but died before he reached his destination, and his scheme died with him.

In 1836 Russia established a 'Polojenia' or system of Armenian self-government in ecclesiastical and educational matters.

The Armenians have national schools of their own, which are, as a rule, under the central control of the Church. At first the Russians did not interfere with the Armenians in the management of their schools, but, when the policy of Russification was adopted, and carried to extremities by Galitzin, the viceroy of the Caucasus, they not only applied pressure in order to secure the control of Armenian Church property and schools, but actually confiscated both (1903). The Armenians made a stout resistance; riots and other disorders continued for a long time, until there was a change of policy, Prince Vorontzoff Dashkoff being appointed in Galitzin's place. At his instigation, the Church property

and schools were restored to the Armenians. He still holds his appointment and is very popular among the Armenians. Thus the Armenians alone, of all the nations under the dominion of Russia, have succeeded in keeping possession of their Church property and schools.

The Meliks have fallen, but their spirit still survives. The Armenians have supplied Russia with many great generals; a fact proving that the martial ardour of the nation is not dead. The names of Count Loris Melikoff, the framer of the Russian Constitution and a great general, who held a command in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–8, Generals Ter-Goukassoff and Lazareff and many other Armenians have an honourable place in the military annals of Russia.

Many Armenians have also attained to high offices in the Russian Government and distinguished themselves in various other civic capacities.

Armenians and Turkey

In the fourteenth century the Turks succeeded in subjugating Armenia, but not the Armenians. The Ottomans are comparatively new-comers in Asia Minor, but the Armenians have been established in their present seats from time immemorial.

Amongst the Armenians of Asia Minor, the Paulician sect, which dates from the sixth and seventh century A.D., still had adherents; these were, naturally, opposed to the established Armenian Church. According to J. S. Stuart Glennie,[1] it was some Armenian missionaries belonging to the sect of the Paulicians who sowed in Europe the seeds of the Reformation. On the arrival of the Ottomans in Asia Minor, the Paulicians and some other sects that were at variance with the Orthodox Church entered into friendly relations with the new-comers and gradually became assimilated to them.

Armenians were also forced into Mohammedanism by the Ottoman practice of collecting a yearly tribute of Christian boys, out of whom was formed an army of janizaries. The Ottoman treatment of Armenians differed from that of any other Mohammedan Power. The Ottomans regarded them as slaves and called them *giaours* (infidels).

Not only were they forbidden to carry arms, but in the earlier times they were not allowed to wear the same dress as the Ottomans. Although they were permitted to hold their own religion, obstacles were put in the way of their building churches. Ricaut[2] says: 'In 1660 several

[1] *Europe and Asia*, 1879.
[2] *Histoire de l'état présent de l'Empire Ottoman* (1670).

Armenian churches in Constantinople were burned. When they were rebuilt, they were pulled down by the authorities, who said that it was prohibited to rebuild those churches of which only the foundations remained; if the walls were still standing, it was permitted to build a dome over them. No church bells were allowed.' Even now, in several parts of Armenia, the sound of church bells is not heard. If perchance permission was gained—by bribery or influence—for the building of a new church, there were regulations as to its height and design, so that it might not differ greatly from an ordinary house. This explains why all the beautiful churches and monasteries which adorn Turkish Armenia belong to the period before the coming of the Ottomans.

The taxes were not collected in the ordinary way, but let out into the hands of contractors, who extorted more than the due amount.

Armenians were not allowed to serve as soldiers; hence they concentrated their attention on agriculture, cattle-breeding, commerce, and the arts; even up to the present day the commerce, art, and handicrafts of Asiatic Turkey are almost entirely in the hands of Armenians.

Their condition being less oppressive in the Turkish capital than elsewhere, many Armenians migrated thither, where they distinguished

themselves in various walks of life. In Constantinople nearly all the goldsmiths, jewellers, builders, architects, and silk manufacturers are Armenians.

By their services to the Government the Armenians attained high positions. The offices they held often became hereditary, e.g. the Tatian family were gunpowder makers to the Government; the Tiuzian family had the mint in their hands; the Palian family were the royal architects.

Formerly Turkey was divided into large provinces, named after the races who dwelt in them, e.g. Moldavia, Wallachia, Servia, Greece. In the seventeenth, and in the beginning of the eighteenth, centuries, these provinces were governed by Armenian Amiras. These privileges lasted until the Crimean War.

In 1461 an Armenian Patriarchate was set up in Constantinople as head of ecclesiastical affairs in Turkey.

In 1860 a National Constitution of the Armenians in the Turkish Empire was granted, by which a Representative Assembly was established, consisting of several councils, ecclesiastical, educational, political, &c. This Assembly still continues and is concerned chiefly with the national, religious, and educational affairs of Turkish Armenia.

Ever since the fall of the Rubenian kingdom there have been places in the mountainous regions of Cilicia where the Armenians retain their independence, thanks to the inaccessibility of the country. Such places are Zeitun and Hajin, which are governed by four Armenian princes, paying a small tribute to the Turkish Government. In 1862 a dispute arose between the Armenian village Alabash and the Turkish village Fetman; and, on this pretext, Aziz Pasha of Marash marched to Zeitun with 30,000 troops for the purpose of subjecting it. They reduced the village of Alabash to ruins; then they attacked Zeitun, but the Armenians of Zeitun repulsed them, with great loss. The Government summoned the four Armenian princes to Marash, but they would not go, sending instead a deputation to ask the help of Napoleon III.

Through Napoleon's mediation, the Sultan was induced to publish an Irade, leaving Zeitun its administrative powers, law-courts and police.

In 1895, when Armenians were being slaughtered wholesale in Asia Minor, the Zeitunlis held at bay an army of 60,000 troops for several months, captured a whole battalion with its officers and 600 soldiers, and were only induced to return peacefully to their mountain by the intervention of the foreign consuls at Aleppo.

The Rt. Hon. Lord Bryce gives some particulars :

'These Zeitunlis had only seven or eight thousand fighting men, but the strength of their position enabled them to repel all attacks ; and, like the Montenegrins, to develop a thoroughly militant type of manhood. They are a rude, stern people, with no wealth and little education, and practising no art except that of iron-working—for there is plenty of iron in the mountains that wall them in. From 1800 till now they had forty times been in conflict with the Turks ; in 1836 they successfully resisted the Egyptian invaders ; and in 1859 and 1862 they repulsed vastly superior Turkish armies. In 1864, by European intervention, a sort of peace was erected, and the people were obliged to admit a Turkish garrison, which in 1895 was 600 strong. The Zeitunlis had laid in a stock of grain in anticipation of a general attack by Turks upon Christians, and had for some little while noticed that arms were being distributed by the Turkish officials among the Moslems. When the massacres began in Northern Syria in November 1895, they perceived that they would be the next victims, rose suddenly, and besieged the garrison. After three days, the Turks, whose water supply had been cut off, surrendered. The Armenians disarming them, and arming themselves with the rifles which they found in the arsenal, had also weapons enough to supply some of the neighbouring villages, and were able to take the field against the Turkish army which was advancing against them, and which is said to have been at times 60,000 strong. They repulsed the Turks, with great loss, in a series of hard-fought fights, and kept them at bay till February

1896. Through the mediation of the British Ambassador at Constantinople, terms of peace were arranged in pursuance of which the siege was raised, and no fresh garrison placed in the town. The most perilous moment had been one when, the fighting men being all absent, the imprisoned Turkish soldiers had risen and sought to set fire to the town. The women, however, proved equal to the occasion. They fell upon the Turks and saved the town.'

Mr. M. Philips Price, who has just returned from Zeitun, writes :

'The government is practically in the hands of a couple of noble Armenian families, whose ancestors have ruled Zeitun for centuries, and the Armenian Gregorian Bishop. The Turkish authorities are almost unable to do anything in the town without the support of these men. . . .

'If the Turks were wise, they would recruit a local militia among the Zeitunlis and make them police their own country under the Sultan's name. The Zeitunli's pride would be touched at once, and he would be the most loyal and devoted Osmanli if he were treated with a little tact.'

Another mountain stronghold which, like Zeitun, has retained its independence is Sasoun. In 1894, when Turkish Ashirats attacked this place, with the object of plundering it, its inhabitants drove them back, whereupon the Turkish Government sent regular troops against the defenders. These troops committed fearful outrages and destroyed many villages.

A commission, consisting of representatives of England, France, and Russia, was formed to inquire into this matter. The finding of this Commission was, that the Armenians had not acted on the offensive, but in self-defence. The result of this was a scheme of reform for the administration of the six Armenian vilayets.

The Sasoun incident was the prelude of the unprecedented massacres and atrocities, organised by the Government, which were committed in all parts of Armenia.

Armenians in America

The earliest mention of the presence of Armenians in America relates to the year 1655. A book, entitled 'The Beginners of a Nation,'[1] gives some interesting details concerning these Armenian immigrants. At the period in question (1655) the governor of Virginia was a certain Edward Digges, son of Sir Dudley Digges, who, in the course of his life, held the offices of Master of the Rolls and Russian Ambassador. Edward Digges, who was engaged in the silk trade, used at first to import fabrics from London, but, as it appears, he had some knowledge of the Armenians and their industries, so, being anxious to introduce silkworm-breeding into Virginia, he

[1] By Edward Egglestone, published in New York, 1897.

brought over two Armenians who were familiar with this art. But, in spite of these efforts, he failed to establish the culture of silkworms in his province, the attention of the people being entirely absorbed by the growing and manufacture of tobacco. Disheartened by this ill success, the Armenians were about to return to their own country, but the Virginian Assembly, being anxious that they should stay and persevere in their undertaking, and being especially desirous of keeping one of them, named George, tried to induce the latter to remain by presenting him with the gift of 4000 lb. of tobacco;[1] at the same time, with a view to the promotion of silkworm-breeding, offering prizes to colonists who would devote themselves to the production of articles necessary for this pursuit. So Armenians were the pioneers of the silk manufacture of America.

Armenian *colonies* in America are of quite recent origin, but, ever since the beginning of the nineteenth century, individual Armenians have gone to America for the sake of education or professional or artistic training. The first to go was Khachatouz Voskanian, who went in 1834, at the age of sixteen, in order to complete his studies. He became a journalist, contributed

[1] See Philip Alexander Bruce, *Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, vol. i., pp. 365, 368.

to American papers and took part in many American literary movements. The next after him was Harutiun Vehapetian, who also went in pursuit of learning, and who afterwards became Patriarch successively of Constantinople and of Jerusalem. From 1834 to 1867 there were altogether 50–60 Armenians in America; in 1870–71 there were 69. The real emigration of this people to America began during the misery produced in Armenia by the Russo-Turkish war of 1876–7. During this period Armenians began to migrate to America, not only for purposes of culture, but also for the sake of making money and returning, with improved fortunes, to take up a better position in their own land, for no Armenian leaves his own country with the intention of settling permanently in another. The influx of Armenian emigrants into America serves as a thermometer to measure the misfortunes of Armenia. It is only necessary to examine the statistics of Armenian emigration between 1877 and the present time in order to estimate the unhappy state of the country. If persecution, massacres, &c., increase, the tide of emigration swells in proportion.

In 1912 arrived 9350, and in 1913 10,000, Armenians. There are now in America more than 100,000 Armenians.

Armenians in Egypt

Space does not allow us to speak of Armenians in Egypt, where, from early times, there has been a flourishing Armenian colony, many members of which have high positions in the government. Lord Cromer, comparing them with other races in modern Egypt, says :

'The Syrians, in spite of their ability, have so far never been able to push beyond places of secondary, though considerable, importance. Armenians, on the other hand, have attained the highest administrative ranks, and have at times exercised a decisive influence on the conduct of public affairs in Egypt.' [1]

He speaks of the great work accomplished for the regeneration of Egypt by the great statesman, Nubar Pasha, who held the position of Prime Minister and other responsible offices. He speaks also of Boghos Pasha (son of Nubar) as well as Tigrane Pasha and Yacub Artin Pasha, who have held important governmental positions.

[1] *Modern Egypt*, ii., 220.

CHAPTER II

CULTURE

OTHER races picture the Armenians as prostrated by what they have undergone, without breathing-time or strength for intellectual culture. Yet during 1913 they celebrated, with an *abandon* of joy in proportion to their sufferings, events to be rightly appreciated only by nations who know what intellectual culture is.

Last year was the fifteenth centenary of the invention of their alphabet, and the fourth of the printing of their first book; and the importance which they attach to these two events proves their love of knowledge.

The introduction of Christianity imparted fresh vigour to their national life, and a great impulse to literary activity. By the order of Patriarch Sahak the learned Mesrop invented an alphabet of the Armenian language in the year A.D. 404, and caused the whole Bible to be translated into Armenian. Up to that time the Armenians had possessed the Bible only in

Greek and Syriac, which the Armenian Christians could not understand. It is interesting to note that in constructing his alphabet Mesrop followed the Greek—that is, the Western—forms, rather than the Syrian. Armenian is therefore written, like European languages, from left to right, not, like Oriental languages, from right to left. Moreover, it possesses a separate symbol for each of the vowels, which have not to be distinguished, as in Oriental languages, by vowel marks, and the spelling is more phonetic than that of English and some other European languages. Hence it is easily read—an important matter, since other Oriental languages —Arabic for example—are difficult to read on account of their not being phonetic and their following the vowel-point system, which must be a drawback from the learner's point of view.

A close examination of the Armenian language throws much light on the character of the ancient Armenians and proves that they were a cultured people. In the Armenian language there is a greater abundance than in any other tongue of words, handed down from ancient times, denoting different varieties of domestic animals. In other Oriental languages we often find a number of names for the same animal, but these words are all synonymous with one another, e.g. in Arabic there are nearly seventy words meaning

'camel' and 'lion,' some of which are used in one part of the country, others in another; but, in Armenian, each of the words denotes a different variety of the animal. The same remark applies to groups of animals, such as 'flock' or 'herd'; also to names of cereals, weeds, &c., and to names of insects which damage vegetation. This shows that the ancient Armenians were a pastoral and agricultural people; but, at the same time, their style of living was not mean nor was their dress poor, as is the case with other mountainous nations. This is proved by the number of words in the language referring to weaving and denoting articles of wearing apparel. On the other hand, there are scarcely any Armenian words denoting marine animals. This is a proof that Armenians have always dwelt inland.

It is a well-known fact that all old Eastern nations use proper names derived from occupations or personal characteristics. Ancient Armenian names, preserved by historians, show that the Armenians were engaged in the arts and sciences as well as in pursuits requiring practical knowledge and ability. Nearly all the names of places in Armenia are derived from Armenian proper names, a fact which tends to prove that the country has been Armenian from time immemorial.

Mesrop also founded a school which produced writers who soon made it famous throughout Armenia ; and to procure that knowledge which was only to be found abroad he sent a considerable number of young men, distinguished by birth and talent, to Edessa, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Athens, and even Rome, to study the languages, philosophy, and literature of Syria and Greece. The pursuit of letters was taken up by these students with much ardour, and a great number of Greek and Syrian authors were translated into Armenian. The works of these authors (about 700,000 volumes) perished in the Alexandrian Library, but fragments of them have been preserved in Armenian (' Berosus, ' Abydenus,' ' Manetho,' ' Cephalion,' &c.).

The fifth century is styled the ' Golden Age ' of Armenian literature. Moses of Khorene, the first of Armenian historians, was the author of a history of Armenia from the beginning of the world to the destruction of the Arsacidae (2277 B.C. to A.D. 428). There are upwards of fifty chronicles and histories written in ancient Armenian, which is richer in literature than the Greek of the same period, and so flexible and suitable to every kind of translation that, if the ' Anabasis ' of Xenophon, for instance, were lost, it might be almost literally reproduced in Greek from the Armenian rendering. Among

the writings which now exist only in Armenian translations, the originals having been lost, the most important are the first part of the 'Chronicle of Eusebius,' and several of the works of Philo. Some of them have been translated into all the European languages (one of the classics into thirty-six), and they give very succinct accounts of the Persian and Mongol invasions, and throw a new light on the state of the East during the Middle Ages.

The most notable works of ancient Armenian literature are as follows :

Eznik (A.D. 440–445) gives an interesting account of the various forms of worship among the Ancients, and includes a summary of the creeds of the Persian fire-worshippers and other pagans, as well as of the doctrines of the Greek philosophers, and those of the Marcionites and Manicheans.

Korune (A.D. 444) gives the biography of the learned Mesrop, the inventor of the Armenian characters (36).

Agathangelos gives full accounts of the state of society in his own time, and is the best authority on paganism in Armenia previous to the introduction of Christianity.

Faustus Byzand was a historian (A.D. 337–384). His pure, simple, and elegant style is esteemed the best example of Armenian composition.

Eghishe (A.D. 462 or 464) wrote a 'History of the Vardanants,' in which he ably recounts the persecutions inflicted by the Persians on the Armenians, and the wars sustained by the latter in defence of their native Christianity. He is a poet rather than a historian, and next to the Bible his works are most widely read.

Lazar of Parpi (A.D. 440 or 443) was born of an ancient and noble family, and educated together with the very popular Prince Vahan, of the Mamigonian family. He records the invention of the Armenian alphabet, the progress of literature, and the wars of the Armenians against the Persians down to A.D. 485, a period of one hundred years. His life was sad, and he died forsaken and broken-hearted.

In the succeeding centuries, literature suffered considerably from the political troubles, the incessant wars, and the unsettled condition of the nation. The sixth century is remarkable for the regulation of the Calendar, which was settled at a Synod held at Dvin in 552, the opening day of the first year of the new era being on July 11, A.D. 552.

The most distinguished among the writers of the seventh century was *Anania of Shirak*, author of treatises on astronomy, weights and measures, the calculus, and general mathematics. The works of the Armenian historians contemporary with him contain records of national events which

are accepted as perfectly authentic and valuable for details.

Gregory of Narek was the Pindar of Armenia. His sacred elegies (95 in number) are elevated in style, showing Arabian influence, and very pure in sentiment. His canticles and melodies are still chanted in the Armenian Church. Verbosity is a characteristic of all his work; on one occasion the word God is accompanied by ninety adjectives.

Nerses Shnorhali composed a poem of 4000 verses and a sublime elegy of 2090 verses on the capture of Edessa, which are perfect gems of the poetic art. His beautiful prayer is universally known and has been printed in all languages. He is the Fénélon of Armenia.

Nkhitar Gosh was the author of ninety fables marked by good taste, purity, and elegance. He also codified the civil and ecclesiastical laws. His work is very popular and has been through twenty-seven editions.

The works of later centuries are interesting. Some of them illustrate the changes taking place in the language.

At the end of the eighteenth century an Armenian monk named *Mkhitar Sepastatzi* established an Armenian Brotherhood at St. Lazar in Venice who devoted themselves to literature. This Brotherhood is still in existence, and has a branch in Vienna. During this period

of more than a century its members have printed hundreds of old MSS. of historical value. They have also produced many works dealing with history and other branches of learning, and translations of foreign classics, thus rendering a great service to Armenian literature.

It will be remembered that Byron stayed at St. Lazar and studied Armenian. He actually took part in the publication of an Armenian-English dictionary and grammar.

The first book printed in an Oriental language was in Armenian.

The Koran was printed in Arabic in Venice in 1518, the first Russian book that was ever published appeared in 1564, and in America the first printed book appeared in 1640. Before all these an Ephemeris in the Armenian language was published in 1512 in Venice by a certain Hagob. It indicates saints' days and festivals; and also contains prescriptions for different ailments, and other information.

This first book was soon after followed by others, mostly religious, printed in Armenian, and the art quickly spread among the Armenians in other places besides Venice.

In 1906 an exhibition of printing was held at Marseilles; the first book printed in that city was the Bible in the Latin language, published by Vosgan Vardapet, an Armenian monk.

Armenian printing presses and newspapers now flourish in almost every part of the world. The Armenians were the first people of the Near East to issue a newspaper. This was the *Azdarar*, the first number of which appeared in 1794 at Madras.

Political changes always affect the general life of a nation. In 1828 Russia occupied the Armenian provinces. The Russian Armenians were then united to those of the Transcaucasus, and thousands also immigrated from Persia and Turkey into what was now Russian Armenia. These events produced a strong Armenia. National Schools were soon opened. An Armenian Academy was established in Moscow in 1815, and a seminary named Nercessian, in Tiflis, in 1826. Many Armenians went to Moscow, St. Petersburg, and abroad, chiefly to the German University of Dorpat, to obtain a University education. This educational revival produced a new era, and Abovian, who had received a European education, wrote the first book in modern Armenian. S. Nazarian, also educated in Europe, published a monthly journal, called *Hiusisapail*, in Moscow, in 1858. Before this, journalism had been a familiar idea to all Armenians; as we have said above the first Armenian paper had been published at Madras in 1794. It was followed by other papers in Constantinople,

Tiflis, and Moscow. But *Hiusisapail* had a mission. It had to fight against ignorance, chiefly the ignorance of the clergy; and when it appeared, a fierce conflict was raging round the question of language. Some desired that the old Armenian tongue should be preserved, the group whose views appeared in *Hiusisapail* wished to adopt the vernacular as the literary medium. Among these were such leading writers of their time as M. Nalbandian, Raffi, R. Patkanian, and S. Shahaziz, who were then young, but afterwards made themselves a great name, and are still the stars of Armenian literature. The new movement succeeded, and the people's language became the literary language. M. Nalbandian was a great contributor to the *Hiusisapail*, and his prose was that of a fighter. He travelled in Europe, and on his return was imprisoned for three years in the fortress of Petropavlovsk, at St. Petersburg; an imprisonment which he did not long survive. The reason of his confinement was a suspicion that, when abroad, he had joined the Russian Nihilists. At that time revolutionary ideas were rife in Russia, and the severity of the Russian Government towards the intellectuals was very great, since they were suspected of revolutionary sympathies. The intellectuals among the Armenians suffered equally with those among the Russians.

In 1827 a newspaper called *Mshak* was published in Tiflis, under the editorship of Dr. Arzrouni. Raffi was its foremost contributor. It was, from the first, a fighting paper in all spheres of controversy. There are now no less than three hundred Armenian newspapers in existence, published in different towns ; also literary, scientific, educational and ethnological monthly reviews. The intellectual centre of Russian Armenia is Tiflis ; that of the Armenians in Turkey is Constantinople, where many Armenian reviews and newspapers are published. Other important dailies are *Horizon* (Tiflis), *Azatamart* and *Buzandion* in Constantinople.

Since the fall of the Abdul Hamid *régime* another literary revival has taken place in Constantinople and many new Armenian writers have come into notice. Some of the best known of living authors in Turkish Armenia are : Minas Cheraz, K. Zohrab, Arshag Tchobanian, M. Portoukalian, R. Zartarian, and others.

Armenian Novelists

It was in the earlier part of the nineteenth century that the classical Armenian language was superseded by the modern. Before that time, though modern dialects had existed for centuries, classical Armenian remained the literary lan-

guage, and nearly all books were written in it. Some popular poetry—mostly folk-songs —existed, written in modern Armenian, but the first work of importance written in that language was ' Verk Hayastani ' (' The Wounds of Armenia '), by *Kh. Abovian*, who had received a European education. The book is written in the form of a novel, but it is rather an outpouring of feeling about the sorrows of Armenia than a novel in the ordinary sense; nevertheless it is commonly regarded as the first novel written in modern Armenian. This work has been a source of inspiration and enthusiasm for generations. Its principal value was that it was written in a language which could be understood by the people; and thus it has laid the foundation of modern Armenian literature. Another reason of its popularity is that it appealed to the hearts of all Armenians, although, from the artistic point of view, it is far from faultless. The memory of Abovian is even now greatly cherished. The subject of his novel is rural life. The whole work centres in Kanaker, his birth-place. Abovian suddenly disappeared, and it was thought that his fate had been that which afterwards befell Nalbandian. Later, Abovian had his followers, the chief representative of whom was *Perch Proshian*, who, like his master, took country life as his theme, deriving his

scenes and incidents from his birthplace, Ashtarak. He has written a great many novels, which are a rich ethnological treasury of the manners, customs, habits, &c., of that particular district, but which have no great value as works of fiction. To the same school belongs *Gh. Aghaian.*

It was left for *Raffi* (1837-1888) to write novels in the modern sense. Hence he is considered the chief master and the founder of modern Armenian literature. His works may be divided into the following classes.

Class I. Realistic sketches of Armenian life and the life of the neighbouring peoples—Persians, Turks, &c.

Class II. A trilogy of novels, portraying the sorrows of Armenia : ' Djalaleddin,' ' Khent,' and ' Kaitzer.'

The first two of these novels centre round events in the Russo-Turkish war of 1877. It was a period when several suffering races were liberated from the Turkish yoke ; and the Armenians, who were suffering even more than other nations, dared also to cherish aspirations after deliverance, but their cry was disregarded, and they were put off with the promise of Article 61 of the Treaty of Berlin. By that Treaty Russia was compelled to withdraw her troops from those provinces of Asiatic Turkey which she had conquered. The withdrawal of the troops

brought fresh sufferings on those provinces, as their former masters were reinstated and took vengeance on them for the welcome they had given to the victorious armies. These facts are very vividly pictured in those two novels. The third novel, 'Kaitzer,' gives a life-like description of the past and the present condition of the Armenians, and unfolds schemes of amelioration. The heroes of this novel work for the liberation of the country. The central idea of the trilogy is that the Armenians must be liberated by their own efforts. These three novels made an epoch in Armenian literature, and have had enormous influence on modern Armenians by moulding their ideals, inspiring them with visions of a regenerated Armenia, and rousing them to self-defence. Nothing in Armenian literature has made so profound an impression as these works. They are, certainly, novels with a purpose, but, independently of that, they are works of art, the descriptions of nature are so graphic and impressive, and the types of character so well drawn, the story is of such absorbing interest, that they attract people of all opinions and even those who are indifferent to the fate of Armenia.

Class III consists of historial novels of great value.

Besides portraying the sorrows of Armenia, Raffi's works present nearly every aspect

of Armenian life, for the author treats of the Armenian nation as a whole, and his descriptions of the people are very graphic. His real hero is the Armenian nation; all the delineation of individuals is subsidiary to the portrayal of Armenia. Whoever reads Raffi's novels must become imbued with a deep sense of the misery of the ill-fated land.

Raffi does not praise everything that is Armenian; he is discriminating and critical, e.g. he attacks the ignorance and unprogressiveness of the clergy of the period, contrasting them with the clergy of past ages who did so much for the uplifting of their country. He attacks also the antiquated system of education and the oppressors of the people, exhorting to strenuous efforts towards a higher standard of life, and exhorting all to unite in action for one common end. These strictures produced beneficial effects.

When Raffi introduces characters belonging to other nations, he does not represent them as fiends, contrasting them with angelic Armenians, but is quite impartial.

Besides writing novels, Raffi excelled in other branches of literature, e.g. poetry, historical researches and essays. Raffi was the spirit of the movement towards inaugurating a new national life, promoting education, and establishing the people's language; he focussed attention upon these aims. To him they were of

supreme importance. His creed was that a nation is no nation without political life, and that economic security is necessary to civilisation, since security of life, property, and honour are the first necessities. He who desires to secure national freedom must do so at the risk of his life. Raffi's was a gospel of national consciousness and self-reliance. His writings have brought in an era of new glory, and have made him the idol of the whole Armenian race.

Dzerentz has written historical novels, laying his scene in Cilicia during the Rubenian Period.

Of the living novelists in Russian-Armenia, one of the best is *Shirvanzade*, who belongs to the realistic school and has written good novels of literary and artistic value.

Abovian's school took for its subject rural life; *Raffi's* school, national life; *Shirvanzade's* theme is town life. He treats of the middle classes, chiefly in the Black City (Baku), where naphtha quickly transforms poverty into riches. His 'Artist,' 'Chaos,' 'Namus,' 'La Possédée,' are works of value. He has written also some successful dramas.

Aharonian is the most popular of living authors; he leans towards idealism and symbolism, and has produced some fine short stories.

After the massacre of 1896, a great stream of immigration poured into the Caucasus. The immigrants brought stories of misery, which Aharonian

recorded. There is an atmosphere of gloom in all his writings, and his narratives have the effect of saddening the reader. His style is poetical and picturesque.

Another writer of successful short stories is *V. Papazian.*

Other novelists of note are *Leo* (also a historian), *Nar-Dos*, and *Atrpet.*

Armenian Music and Poetry

Quite recently Armenian folk-lore songs have been set to music by Komitas Vardapet; and, before him, a few by Ekmalian and Kara Murza. They have aroused considerable interest and admiration in some parts of Europe. The well-known French musical critic, Prof. Louis Laloy, says 'Armenian music is neither European nor Oriental, but has a character peculiar to itself. The airs are very soft, and full of life. The melody comes straight from the heart, and has a bright clear lilt. There is sunshine in the songs—not the scorching sun of the deserts of Persia or Arabia; rather a golden light, most heavenly, shedding a caressing warmth on the white mountain snows, caressing, too, the green of the forests, and the running brooks. Armenians may be right when they say that Eden was in Armenia, in the bosom of Mount Ararat; for this country, with its sad

history, has been a chosen land, where nature is so prolific, and so lavish in her favours to man.'

The *Standard* musical critic, speaking of Armenian music, says: 'Taken from the rich store of Armenian literature the Armenian music was distinctly Asiatic, but at the same time, being itself the music of hillmen, seemed to have some affinity with the national airs of the Scottish Highlanders, possessing much the same barbaric simplicity, and the same suggestion of the wind soughing among the trees.'

There exists a rich Armenian folk-lore, some of which has been written down. The tales are very simple, quaint, and characteristic. From the sixteenth to the eighteenth century there were many Armenian poets of high excellence, but their verse was composed only to be sung, and often did not survive to be celebrated, only a few specimens having been preserved in the song-books into which they happened to find their way.

Ancient Armenian historians have preserved fragments of songs dating from the period before Christ.

These were chiefly legends referring to Armenian kings and queens, some of them going back as far as the time when these monarchs were believed to be gods and goddesses; and they were sung by Armenian *gousank* (minstrels).

The province of Goghtan, on the banks of the Araxes, was famous for its minstrels. This place abounded in gardens and vineyards, and produced a variety of good wines. The people were gay and fond of merry-making. Their love of the old pagan religion and manners still continued long after their conversion to Christianity. In this respect they resembled the Saxons of Germany, and even in the early part of the fifth century they observed pagan rites, sometimes openly, sometimes secretly.

One of these songs describes, as follows, the birth of the Armenian king, Vahagn:—

'Heaven and earth were in travail,
In travail was the crimson sea;
And in the sea
The ruddy reed was in travail.
From the stem of the reed issued smoke,
From the stem of the reed issued flame;
And out of the flame sprang the child;
His locks were fiery, his beard was ablaze,
His eyes were suns.'[1]

[1] The style and metre of these old poems have nothing in common with Greek poetry, but they bear some resemblance to old Hebrew songs. Little is known about the metre, but as a rule the lines consist of seven or eight syllables, as is also the case with most of the folk-songs. Alliteration is occasionally used and parallelism is of frequent occurrence; cf. for the latter, *Judges* v. 30: 'To Sisera a prey of divers colours, a prey of divers colours of needlework, of divers colours of needlework on both sides.'

This is a myth, describing the rising of the sun over the sea.

The combats of Vahagn, with dragons and other supernatural beings, were also sung. Vahagn, having stolen some corn from the barns of King Barsharm of Assyria, ran away and tried to hide himself in Heaven, but, in his flight, the corn was spilt on the road. Hence arose the Milky Way, which is called in Armenia 'the Track of the Cornstealer.'

There are also poems relating to the sanctity of family life. The beauty of the Armenian king, Ara, having captivated Queen Semiramis, after the death of Ninus, she invites him to Nineveh to be her husband, promising him the half of her kingdom,but he refuses her offer, as he already has a wife. This angers Semiramis, who sends a great army against Ara, with orders to capture the king alive and bring him to her; but they carry her his dead body instead. As is well known, Semiramis used to practise magic. Taking the corpse of Ara, she lays it on a certain height, in order that the gods may descend and restore it to life by licking the wounds. This high place is still called *Lezk*, and in former times others used it for the same purpose as Semiramis. The idea of the mode of cure probably originated from the fact that wounded men lying unconscious on the battlefield have often been revived by the licking of dogs and other animals.

Another of these extant songs, belonging to the time before the Christian era, has as its subject the love-story of King Artashes II, one of the greatest kings of the Arsacid dynasty. Artashes gained a victory over the King of the Alans, whose son was taken prisoner. The king offered many precious things as a ransom for the prince, but Artashes refused to release his captive. Then the prince's sister, Satenik, went to the bank of the river where the Alans were encamped, and, ascending a high hill, in a loud voice thus addressed the king :—

'O brave Artashes, to thee I speak ! Consent to set my brother free. I am the fair-eyed daughter of the Alan king.'

Artashes came down to the river-bank, and, seeing the girl's beauty, fell in love with her. Then the poem continues :—

'Brave King Artashes
Mounted his fine black steed.
He took the golden ring
Of the red leathern rope
And passed, like an eagle
With swift wing, over the river.
He cast the golden ring
Of the red leathern rope
Over the back
Of the Alan maiden,
Causing great pain
To the back of the tender maiden,
And with speed bore
Her to his camp.'

The ancient Armenian historian, Movses Khorenatzi, thus explains the introduction of the rope into the story.

Among the Alans—he says—red leather was very valuable, and the rope with golden ring signifies gold coin, so that the meaning of this incident is, that Artashes gave a great quantity of red leather and gold to the father of the princess whom he took to wife.

The same poem contains a description of the wedding :—

'It rained gold when Artashes became a bridegroom,
It rained pearls when Satenik became a bride.'

In some parts of Armenia it is still the custom for the nearest relatives of the bridegroom to throw money over the bride's head among the crowd, during the wedding procession.

Artashes died in a foreign country, while engaged in a campaign. In his last moments he is seized with home-sickness, as he remembers his fatherland. The poem gives his dying words :—

'Who will once more bring before my eyes the smoke from the chimneys of my home; the New Year's morn, the chase of the stag, the coursing of the deer, amid the sound of the horn and the beat of the drum?'

When he was dying, his son, Artavazd, said to him, referring to the great slaughter made during the campaign :—

'You are taking the whole country with you; how can I reign over the ruins?'

This enraged the dying king, who, raising his head, cursed his son, in these words :—

'When thou goest a-hunting over the free heights of Ararat, the Giants will capture thee; they will take thee to their free Ararat; there thou wilt remain, not seeing the light.'

According to legend, this prediction was fulfilled; Artavazd was caught by the Giants, imprisoned in a cave, and loaded with chains. Two of his faithful dogs tried to bite through the chains, and he strove to free himself, that he might avenge his wrongs by annihilating the world; but all attempts were vain, for his fetters were still further strengthened by the beat of the blacksmith's hammer.

In some parts of Armenia it is still customary on the night of Good Friday for blacksmiths to strike their anvils in silence.

Gradually the spirit of these songs changed; the poets ceased singing of gods and goddesses, and began to sing of noble heroes.

All these songs were accompanied by musical instruments.

All the songs of this early period have come down to us only in fragments, most of which are recorded by the historian, Movses Khorenatzi.

The only long poem that we have complete

is 'Sasma Tzrer.' This epic consists of a cycle of four stories, which are recited in some parts of Armenia even up to the present time.

In the Bible, it is said that, when Sennacherib, King of Assyria, was praying in the temple, his sons, Adramelech and Sannassar, murdered him and escaped to Armenia.

The Armenian epic is based on this story, and on the exploits of the fugitives in Armenia.

This epic is mentioned by ancient historians, but it has only been reduced to writing in recent times, having been previously handed down orally.

Minstrels abounded in Armenia, and some of them were able poets, whose songs possessed great charm.

The introduction of Christianity engendered a new species of poetry—namely hymns and chants. The thirteenth century was a flourishing period of hymn writing. Some of the best Armenian hymns were composed at that time. It was during that period that Bishop Khachatour Taronetzi invented distinctly Armenian musical notes, which are quite unrelated to the European ones, so that Armenians had now, not only an alphabet of their own, but also their own musical notation, and their hymns could be set to music. This notation was improved in the eighteenth century. Hymns have always been popular

among the Armenians; even peasants know them by heart and sing them. The hymn-tunes are quite unique, being entirely independent of those of other Christian nations. Their somewhat strange rhythm recalls the chorus of singers around the altar of the pagan gods. No doubt, the Armenians have introduced some pagan melodies into Christian hymn-tunes.

The Armenians are rich in folk-songs. The music to which these songs are set possesses great charm. In it, also, the rhythm is most important. An Armenian composer, speaking of these folk-songs, says :—

'By means of those ethereal and heavenly waves of melody, one sees those enchanting mermaids, who, after dancing on the banks of large and small lakes, leaning on the waters, allure towards themselves the pagan Armenians, offering amorous kisses to all minstrels.'

In later years Armenian music and poetry were affected by European influence, but in her hymns and folk-songs Armenia has musical treasures that are all her own.

For centuries music and song have become a joy to Armenians through minstrels called *ashoughs*. Ashoughs are invited to all weddings and other festivities, where they are the life of the party and the makers of merriment. They sing also on the bridges in the squares, and wander from courtyard to courtyard. Their

song is not always merry; it is sometimes sad, sometimes even bitter. They always carry with them their *saz* or *tar*, or *kamancha*, Oriental instruments, on which they accompany their songs. Many of the ashoughs are blind. To be an ashough is considered a high attainment. In order to acquire the art, anyone who aspires to become an ashough first observes a fast of seven weeks, then goes to the monastery of the Sourb Karapet, which is the Parnassus of Armenian musicians. The 'Sourb Karapet' is John the Baptist, who is the patron saint of Armenian minstrels. In the Near East, ashoughs (who are mostly Armenians) are greatly admired, not only by Armenians, but by Persians, Turks, and other races, as some of them sing in other languages besides Armenian. Some ashoughs sing their own verses, but, as a rule, the songs are the composition of a special class of poets. The songs of these other ashoughs often reveal deep feelings and many of them are high-class poems. As a typical *ashough*-author, I will only mention *Sayat-Nova*. His lyre has attained extreme sweetness; he combines all the vivid colouring of the East with soft and refined shading. He was born in 1712. He was a special favourite at the court of the Georgian king. In his own words, he 'sat in the palace among the beauties and sang to them,'

but his songs were not merely poems in praise of court-beauties, or for their amusement; they were an expression of the deep feelings of his heart. There was a 'dark lady' behind his verse, to whom he addressed nearly all his songs.

Here is a picture of his lady-love:—

'Thy waist is like a cypress-tree, sugar thy tongue, in sooth;
Thy lip is candy, and thy skin like Frankish satin smooth.
Thy teeth are pearls and diamonds, the gates of dulcet tones;
Thine eyes are gold-enamelled cups adorned with precious stones.
Thou art a rare and priceless gem, most wonderful to see;
A ruby rich of Mt. Bedakhsh, my love, thou art to me.
A young vine in the garden fresh thou art to me, my fair,
Enshrined in greenness, and set round with roses everywhere.
I, like the love-lorn nightingale, would hover over thee.
A landscape of delight and love, my queen, thou art to me!
Speak but one word, to say thou art Sayat-Nova's love,
And then what matters aught to me, in earth or heaven above?'

His love is so intense that one sees at once that he is capable of deep feelings and one is drawn to him; yet this love is so pure and unselfish. He describes his love as a sea and

himself as a little barque, floating on it. For ten years he has wooed the lady as a prince, but without success; he will not relinquish the pursuit of her but resolves now for seven years to pay court to her in the character of a pilgrim-minstrel. Her indifference does not discourage him, and he asks her:

'Alas! how have I offended thee; that thou art so cold? The world is sated with the world, my heart its hunger keeps.'

He is even content only to sleep on her doorstep. There is something else that is a part of his life; namely, his *kamancha*. He threatens to cut the strings of his instrument if he is a week without seeing his beloved. He will not call death death if he knows that she weeps for him, letting her hair fall over his grave. His faith in his love for her is so great that he tells her that, if she desires even immortality, he will gain it for her by his love.

Once he comes face to face with his lady-love and says:—

'What avails me now a physician? The ointment burns, and does not heal the wound, but your medicine is a different one.'

But she replies that she has no remedy for him. In another poem he is in despair, and says:—

'Without thee, of what use is the world's wealth. I will don the habit of a monk and visit the monasteries one by one. Perhaps in one of them I shall discover a way of redemption from my hopeless love.'

In another poem he expresses the wavering between earthly and heavenly life, saying :—

'If one obeys the will of the soul, then the body is offended. How shall I escape this sorrow?'

At last he carries out his threat and becomes a monk. He secludes himself from the world in a lonely monastery, far away from Tiflis; but once he hears that a minstrel has come to that city whom none can equal, whereupon he steals out of the monastery, disguised as a layman, and taking his *saz* with him, goes to Tiflis, enters into contest with the new minstrel, and, conquering him, saves the honour of his native town.

In 1795 Agha Mohammed Khan laid waste Tiflis and many other towns of that region. His soldiers entered the monastery where Sayat-Nova was praying, and commanded him to come out and become a Mohammedan, if he wished to save his life; but he replied, in verse, that he was an Armenian and would not deny his Christ. He was therefore martyred on the spot.

Ashoughs still exist, but there are few left now. *Nahaget Kouchak* was a fine poet of the

seventeenth century. He is called the Psalmist of Love. Although there is a slight resemblance in style between his writings and those of Persian poets, his poetry is original. His works, as a whole, have only recently been published; they have been translated into French and other languages, and greatly admired. Some critics place him higher than Saadi and other Persian poets.

But, as a matter of fact, in modern Armenian literature it was poetry that was the first to burst into bloom and that reached maturity soonest. Armenia can boast of some very great poets. Among these Raphael Patkanian became the great national bard. Many of his poems were written during the Turco-Russian war, when Armenians cherished high hopes for the deliverance of Turkish-Armenia from the Ottoman yoke. Alishan, a monk of the Mechitarist Convent at Venice, was a distinguished antiquarian and historian, as well as a poet.

In 1860, when a national and ecclesiastical constitution was granted to the Armenians in Turkey, we find a revival of Armenian literature going on in Constantinople. Among the finest Armenian poets in Turkey of this period were M. Peshiktashlian and P. Durian.

Although the influence of the poetry of the past endures, new elements have now been

added to poetry, and new forms have arisen. There is a change also in the style and in the subject of modern Armenian poetry, of which the great representatives are, of the living poets : Hovhaness Hovhanessian, Hovhaness Thoumanian, A. Isahakian, Siamanto, Tzatourian, and V. Terian.

Architecture

The recent excavations made by professors of the Vienna and St. Petersburg Universities have revealed new horizons and thrown new light on Armenian architecture and sculpture, which have hitherto been confused with those of Byzantium. It is now established that Armenia had an architecture of her own, even before the Christian era, and that, in her turn, she has influenced other countries. The most characteristic examples are the churches, the style of which is (like the Armenian Church itself) extremely national, and represents the Armenian spirit. From the ninth to the twelfth century there was a great revival in church architecture, and churches were built by all wealthy Armenians who were desirous of leaving a name behind them.

The existing remains of ancient Armenian architecture consist of churches, monasteries, palaces, castles, and fortresses, which are to be found all over Armenia. The ruins of Ani, the

capital of Ancient Armenia, form a rich store of such remains. Many of them are in good preservation. For some time excavations and researches have been going on in and round Ani under the supervision of Prof. Marr, of St. Petersburg University. Sanahin, too, contains good examples of Armenian architecture. Turkish Armenia also abounds in such remains. Moreover, Armenian architects have distinguished themselves outside of Armenia. In various parts of the Byzantine Empire they bore a high reputation; and they have left traces of their skill in Constantinople, dating from the period before its occupations by the Turks, as well as in several other places. The dome of St. Sophia, which was destroyed by an earthquake, was reconstructed by Trdat, an Armenian architect, in 986, during the reign of Basil II.

In the earlier part of the Middle Ages many Armenian architects and other artificers spread over Europe, leaving traces of their skill in European architecture. Prof. H. Strchikovsky, of Vienna University, Prof. Marr, M. Toramanian, and other archæologists are now occupied in tracing out Armenian influence on European art and have already made some interesting discoveries, which tend to show that this influence has, in some cases, been considerable. Prof.

H. Strchikovsky has succeeded in tracing the same influence in German architecture, and the English archæologist, Ferguson, has found traces of the Armenian style of architecture in Ireland. Another archæologist—Schnaze, who has made a study of the St. Sophia of Kiev, has come to the conclusion that it is built in the Armenian style.

Texier, the celebrated archæologist, shows that the Arabs also owe much to Armenian architecture, e.g., the horse-shoe arch, so characteristic of the Moorish style, is Armenian, as is proved by the fact that the earliest example of it is found in the Armenian temple, Tekor.

Armenians have also built for Mussulmans.

After the Turkish occupation of Armenia, Armenian architects made a name for themselves in the capital and elsewhere as builders of palaces, mosques, forts, &c. There was a family of the name of Palian, who were hereditary royal architects and builders. It was they who built the palaces of Ildiz Kiosk, Dolma Bakhche, Chraghan, Beilerbei, the Sublime Porte, the Admiralty, and several other Government edifices. Besides this, all the decorative and artistic work of the ceilings and walls, as well as the carvings on the palace doors, was executed by Armenian masters. One of the beautiful mosques of Stamboul is Noori Osmane Djamesi. Not

only is it the creation of an Armenian architect, but every one of the artisans who took part in its construction was an Armenian.

The Turks have converted several Armenian churches into mosques and have imitated the style of those churches in the building of other mosques, some of which look more like Armenian churches than typical Turkish mosques.

The Armenian cross is a peculiar one. The arms are shorter than those of any other and are placed nearer the top.

Armenian *painting* is also of some interest. The works of Aivazovski, the celebrated marine painter, Edgar Chahine, the well-known etcher, and others have gained a European reputation. Many Armenian artists have exhibited with success in London, Paris, Berlin, St. Petersburg, and other European capitals. Sir Edwin Pears says: 'I believe the Armenian to be the most artistic in Turkey. Many paint well, and some have made a reputation in Russia and France. Amateur painting is so general as to suggest that the race has a natural taste for Art. The picture gallery on the Island of Lazzaro at Venice contains many works of Art by Armenians which have won the approval of Ruskin.'

The *art of illuminating* of Armenia is also very characteristic and quite distinct from that of the East. There are thousands of parchment MSS.

illuminated with innumerable pictures of great interest.

The artistic talent of the Armenians is also displayed in their *embroidery*.

The Armenians have also a *national theatre*, and they can boast of many good actors and actresses. P. Adamian was pronounced by the Russian press in the capital an ideal Shakespeare tragedian. The theatre does not confine itself to the production of Armenian plays, but also includes foreign dramas in its repertory. Classics and problem-plays are the favourites. It is common to see the works of Shakespeare, Ibsen, Mäeterlinck, Suderman, Hauptmann, and even Bernard Shaw on the Armenian stage in Tiflis. The Armenian theatre is independent of pecuniary considerations. The plays are produced by a Dramatic Society, which is supported by wealthy Armenians. Only plays of high artistic value are produced. Plays which merely appeal to uncultured popular taste, such as Chauvinistic, inartistic productions relating to ancient Armenian kings and queens are ignored. Musical plays are not known to the Armenians, but opera is.

G. Sundukian was a great Armenian dramatist.

Is *education* culture? The Armenians have shown great love of it. All over Armenia there is a great network of schools. There are

academies, seminaries, and ordinary elementary schools. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Lazarian Academy of Moscow was founded by the Armenian from whom it derives its name. Even up to the present time it is considered the best academy of Oriental languages in Europe. The Armenian academy in Etchmiadzin, the seat of the Catholicos of all Armenia, the Armenian Seminary of Tiflis, and the Agricultural School at Varag, have produced many scholars and other useful members of the community. The Union of Armenian Schools at Constantinople and Cairo is almost daily opening schools in obscure villages of Armenia. It is striking to come across two neighbouring villages, one of which, being Armenian, is provided with a good school, while the other, being Turkish or Kurdish, has no school at all.

It is a joy to meet a schoolmaster in those parts who speaks with enthusiasm of his work, or of the hope that the next generation will be an educated one. They feel that they have a civilising mission to perform to their semi-barbaric neighbours. This faith of theirs is so strong that it mitigates even their sorrows, and keeps their nationality alive. It is the task of Sisyphus, for they have to prove that might is not right, but that light is might.

CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS

1. *Patriotism*

The chief aim of Armenia—as a small nation—has been self-preservation. This has intensified the patriotism of her people, which is the necessary patriotism of a small nation that desires to live, and which assumes the form of warm devotion to their own country without disparagement of other countries. An Armenian loves his people, but he is also generous and affectionate towards other races; hence his patriotism is not narrow-minded Chauvinism; it has not made Armenians self-centred or prevented them from taking an interest in the customs and institutions of other lands. On the contrary, Armenians have always gone with the times, and have shown intense—almost excessive—enthusiasm for Western ideas. This is seen in their literature, in their schools and in other departments of their life. The Armenian is eager to imbibe Western culture. Whenever

a new school of thought appears in Europe its ideas spread in Armenia almost too quickly, though Armenia still preserves her own individuality unimpaired. Realism, naturalism, and symbolism have all found their way into Armenian literature. Armenia has some schools conducted on the Montessori system. The claim for women's suffrage has not only been made in Armenia, but has been allowed. The late Catholicos, Mikrtich, issued a decree permitting women to have equal votes with men and take part in all elections.

Even eugenics have found their way into Armenia. The Catholicos already mentioned made a decree that before performing a marriage ceremony, every priest must demand from both parties a medical certificate stating that they are free from any disease which could be transmitted to their descendants and are otherwise physically fit for marriage.

Perhaps it is to the character of their patriotism that the remarkable energy of the Armenians may be attributed. From time immemorial prosperous Armenians have always supported national institutions, especially churches and schools. They have founded many scholarships to enable successful students to study in European Universities, and it is by no means uncommon for wealthy Armenians to

bequeath by will large sums of money for educational purposes. Armenian peasants have great faith in the advantages of education and are eager to educate their children. This instinct of self-support and self-reliance in the matter of education is found in the Armenian alone among the small Asiatic nations.

2. *Religion*

The Armenian is also devoted to his Church. This has been testified from very early times. It suffices only to mention the struggle of the Armenians for their religion against the Persian monarch, who led a great army against them, with the intention of enforcing Zoroastrianism. This resistance sprang entirely from the people, for at this time (A.D. 451) there was no king, the Arsacid dynasty having just become extinct. The result of this conflict convinced the Persians of the impossibility of eradicating a religion which was so deeply rooted in the hearts of the people.

The Armenians have suffered for their religion up to the present time; we will not chronicle the unclosed record of martyrdoms.

The Armenian Church resembles the people: like the people, it is democratic; all its officials are elected by its members.

The majority of Armenians belong to the

Mother Church, though other denominations exist in Armenia; but even those who belong to these other denominations scarcely consider themselves outside the National Church, which is greatly appreciated by the Armenians because it, to some extent, supplies the place of a National Government. This year an agreement has been made by the National Church and the denominations to act cordially together.

3. *Women*

In describing the characteristics of a nation it is impossible to omit speaking of the women, for the character and the status of women are the touchstone of a people's civilisation. Family life has been one of the chief factors in sustaining the existence of the Armenian nation.

In pagan times the guardian of the family life was Nané, the third daughter of Aramasdes, and the Goddess of Contrivance. It was believed by the Armenians that contrivance was a necessary power for a woman, because, in the management of the household, she had to make big things out of small ones, and circumstances were already against her on account of the vicissitudes which Armenia was constantly undergoing.

The following story related by Xenophon[1]

[1] *Cyropædia*, Book III.

serves as an illustration of the esteem in which women were held by the Armenians in ancient times.

The Armenian king having revolted against Cyrus, the latter invaded Armenia and conquered him. Cyrus intended to deal very severely with the rebel monarch, but Tigranes, the son of the latter, persuaded him to be more lenient. Xenophon gives a long conversation, discussing the terms of peace, in the course of which Cyrus asked Tigranes, who was newly married and greatly loved his wife, what he would give to regain her freedom, she having fallen into the hands of the victor, together with the other women of the royal family. 'Cyrus,' was the Prince's reply, 'to save her from servitude, I would lay down my life.'

On which Cyrus replied: 'Take then, your own, for I cannot reckon that she is properly our captive, for you never fled from us.' Then, turning to the king, he added: 'And you, Armenian, take your wife and children, without paying anything for them, that they may know they come to you free.'

On the return of the king and prince, after this interview, there was much talk at the Armenian court about Cyrus; one spoke of his wisdom, another of his patience and resolution, another of his mildness; one also spoke of his

beauty, his fine figure and lofty stature, whereupon Tigranes turned to his wife, saying: 'Do *you* think Cyrus handsome?'

'Indeed,' she answered, 'I never looked at him.' 'At whom, then, did you look?' asked Tigranes. 'At him,' was the reply, 'who said that, to save me from servitude, he would give his own life.'

To this day, in the eyes of an Armenian, the woman is the pillar of the house and his most faithful companion. She is a tender mother; and above everything she values her honour, to protect which from barbaric lusts she has, in numerous cases, sacrificed her own life, sometimes even the lives of her children. Among the Armenians, women are not secluded, as among the Mohammedans.

4. *Loyalty and Faithfulness*

Another characteristic of the Armenian is the loyalty and faithfulness they have always shown to their rulers, whether Mohammedan or Christian, after the loss of their own independence. Never once, throughout their history, have Armenians been accused of treachery by the monarchs under whose dominion they were living; they have always been trusted even by their worst enemies, a fact that explains why Mohammedan rulers have

placed them in high offices. There is a saying in Armenia that an Armenian serves a foreigner better than he serves his own countrymen.

5. *Critical Instinct*

It has been said by Armenians themselves that one of their faults is a lack of power to act in unison, but this is not quite accurate. The fact is, that an Armenian, as an individual, is very strong. He always prospers, wherever he is. Now, when two or more strong individualities meet, they do not easily amalgamate. This shows that Armenians have principles and the critical instinct. The tone of their Press and their literature towards established institutions has always been critical; this attitude has been invaluable in reforming abuses and introducing improvements. Thus their critical instinct is positive, rather than negative. When Armenians say that they are disunited, this does not mean that they are at variance with one another, but that they desire more organisation and combination than they have. Armenians have already given proofs that they can organise themselves for different objects; witness their numerous societies, clubs, political parties, and other associations, to which the neighbouring Mohammedan nations can show no parallel.

Another proof of this is that at the present

momentous crisis Armenians of all parties are united and speak only as one.

6. *Honesty*

There is a Persian saying: 'You eat the Kurd's bread, but you sleep in the Armenian's house.' The meaning of this is that, if a Moslem desires food, when travelling, he must go into a Moslem's house, as Christian food is considered impure by Mohammedans. Kurds are Moslems, so their food is not forbidden; but the proverb does not advise a Moslem to sleep in a Kurd's house, because he would be likely to lose his property there, whereas in an Armenian house he will be safe, because Armenians do not steal. In countries where Armenians have settled they constitute a smaller proportion of the criminals than any other race. Stealing is almost unknown among them.

7. *Solidarity*

When Armenians go to foreign countries, wherever they become numerous, the first thing they do is to establish a church, a school, a library: a newspaper follows.

There is a wonderful solidarity among Armenians all over the world. When anything happens that concerns their country, such as the death of a distinguished poet or a national

anniversary or when there is a call for funds for a special object, Armenians in all quarters of the globe act as one.

8. *Occupations*

Besides the learned professions, the chief occupations of the Armenians are trade and commerce, various industries, and agriculture. The peasants, for the most part, are agriculturists, but more of them than of any other Asiatic nation rise to higher occupations.

The latest statistics of the inhabitants of the Caucasus show a larger proportion of Armenians than of other races among those who have risen from a lower to a higher class, not excepting even the ruling Russian race. There can, therefore, be no doubt that, under better conditions than it enjoys at present, Turkish Armenia would become a prosperous country.

Even in the present state of things, many Armenians, who have emigrated to foreign countries and become prosperous there, return to their native land because the love of the Mother Country is so intense in them. If order and security reigned in Armenia, scarcely any Armenians would continue to reside abroad.

9. *Lord Byron on Armenians*

In conclusion we cannot do better than quote the words of Lord Byron, who studied

Armenia, the people, the history, and even the language :—

'The Armenians are an oppressed and a noble nation, which has partaken of the proscription and bondage of the Jews and of the Greeks, without the sullenness of the former, or the servility of the latter. This people has attained riches without usury, and all the honours that can be awarded to slavery without intrigue ; but they have long occupied, nevertheless, a part of the house of bondage, who has lately multiplied her many mansions. It would be difficult, perhaps, to find the annals of a nation less stained with crimes than those of the Armenians, whose virtues have been those of peace and their vices those of compulsion. But whatever may have been their destiny—and it has been bitter—whatever it may be in future, their country must ever be one of the most interesting on the globe ; and perhaps their language only requires to be more studied to become more attractive.'

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

ARTICLE 61 OF THE BERLIN TREATY

This article, which replaced Article 16 of the Treaty of San Stefano, is as follows :—

> 'The Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out, without further delay, the improvements and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds. It will periodically make known the steps taken to this effect to the Powers, who will superintend their application.'

There exists between this Article 61 and Article 16 of the San Stefano Treaty a difference which it is well to recall in order to give its full significance to Article 61. Both Articles demanded reforms; but whilst Article 16 declared that the Armenian Territory, then occupied by the Russian troops, should not be evacuated so long as the reforms were not accomplished, Article 61 substituted for this effective compulsion the collective surveillance of the Powers.

Article 61 has remained a dead letter for thirty-four years; the Powers have not had to superintend the

execution of reforms in favour of the Armenians because the Sublime Porte has not carried out any. On May 11, 1895, after the first massacres of Sassoun, the ambassadors of Great Britain, France, and Russia drew up at Constantinople a Memorandum with a complete scheme of reforms, which was approved by the three other Powers who had signed the Berlin Treaty—Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy—and which was accepted, with some modifications, by the Sublime Porte. In spite of this acceptance, and although it was followed by an Irade of the Sultan, the scheme of 1895 has not been applied.

APPENDIX II

SCHEME OF REFORM OF THE ARMENIAN DELEGATION, 1913

1. The institution in the Armenian provinces of a European High Commissioner, nominated by the Porte, with the consent of the Powers.

2. The institution of a permanent Commission of Control—residing in the provinces, presided over by the High Commissioner—composed of three Mussulman members, three Christian members, and three civil agents delegated by the Powers, and having for its mission the superintendence of the application of the reforms.

3. The creation of a provincial elected Assembly, composed of Mussulmans and Christians in equal numbers. This Assembly shall possess the prerogatives provided by the Law of Reform of the Vilayets of 1880.

In principle the officials shall be half Mussulmans and half Christians.

4. The creation of a gendarmerie and police, to be recruited half amongst Mussulmans and half amongst Christians, with European officers.

5. The reorganisation of justice on the basis provided by the Scheme of 1895, with the addition of some European magistrates.

6. Financial reform conforming to that which was recognised for Macedonia, with the intervention of the Ottoman Bank in the service of the Treasury.

7. Administrative measures to indemnify the victims of agrarian spoliation.

8. Maintenance of national and ecclesiastical rights and privileges.

9. Measures to assure the control of the Kurds and the policing of the nomad tribes.

10. Special arrangements, such as are prescribed by the Scheme of 1895, relative to the application of reforms to the Armenians of Cilicia and of Zeitun.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Transcaucasia and Ararat.* Rt. Hon. James Bryce.

**Our Responsibility for Turkey.* Duke of Argyll. 1896.

Letters from Armenia, by J. Rendel Harris and Helen B. Harris. 1897. James Nisbet & Co., London.

A Ride through Asia Minor and Armenia, by Henry C. Barkley. 1891. John Murray, London.

Pour l'Arménie et la Macédoine. Preface par Victor Bérard ; Introduction par Pierre Quillard, Rapport de Francis de Pressensé. 1904. Société Nouvelle de Librairie et d'Edition, Paris.

Chants Populaires Arméniens, by Archag Tchobanian. 1903. Paul Ollendorf, Paris.

La Politique du Sultan, by Victor Bérard. 1897. Calmann Lêvy, Paris.

Arméniens et Jeunes-Turcs, by A. Adossides. 1910. P.-V. Stock, Paris.

**Armenia : its People, Sufferings, and Demands.* 1913. British Armenia Committee, Queen Anne's Chambers, Westminster.

La Peuple Arménien : son Passé, sa Culture, son Avenir, par Archag Tchobanian, with Preface by Denys Cochin. 1913. Paul Genthner, Paris.

La Question Arménienne, à la lumière des Documents, par Marcel Léart. 1913. Augustin Challamel, Paris.

The Church of Armenia, by Mgr. Malachia Ormanian. Translated by Col. G. Marcar Gregory, V.D. 1901. A. R. Mowbray & Co.

* Denotes importance.

Turkey in Europe: Odysseus.

RAFFI's Works. Apply Mrs. Raffi, 32, Richmond Gardens, Shepherd's Bush, London, W.

Map of Turkish Armenia. Published by the London Armenian United Association.

Armenia. A literary monthly magazine. 175, Fifth Avenue, New York.

Pro Armenia. A monthly journal. 31, Villa d'Alesia, Paris XIVe.

The Friend of Armenia. Published quarterly. 47, Victoria Street, London, S.W.

Europe and the Turks. BUXTON.

Macedonia. BRAILSFORD.

Ararat. A monthly searchlight on Armenia. Published by the London Armenian United Association.

**Armenia: Travels and Studies.* In 2 vols., by H. F. B. LYNCH. 1901. Longmans, Green & Co.

**Turkey and its People*, by Sir EDWIN PEARS.

Armenian Poems, by ALICE STONE. Blackwell. 1896. Boston.

England's Responsibility to Armenia, by CANON MACCOLL. 1895.

The Armenian Church. ARCHDEACON DOWLING.

The Lesser Eastern Churches. ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Yestere. The Romance of a life, by VARTENI (ZABELLE C. BOYAJIAN). A story of the Armenian Massacres by an eye-witness. T. Fisher Unwin. 1901.

* Denotes importance.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. LTD., COLCHESTER
LONDON AND ETON



Stanford's Geog.l Estab.t London.

MAP TO ILLUSTRATE
"TRAVEL & POLITICS IN ARMENIA"
NOTE —The figures on the map give the Armenian population in thousands, of each town with its surrounding district.
Boundary of the Six Armenian Vilayets shown thus
Scale of Miles
50 0 50 100 150 200
Railways open projected
BLACK SEA
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
CASPIAN SEA
PERSIAN GULF
ASIA MINOR
ARMENIA
KURDISTAN
RUSSIA
PERSIA
CONSTANTINOPLE
Scutari
MARMARA SEA
BRUSSA
Adabazar
Eregli
Kastamuni
Sinope
Samsun
Mersivan
Amasia
Tokat
Ordu
Tireboli
TREBIZOND
BATOUM
Akhaltsikh
TIFLIS
Tatev
Nukha
Schamakha
Bakou
Kars
Alexandropol
L. Sewan
Erivan
Baiburt
ERZEROUM
Erzingan
Sivas
Karahissar
ANGORA
Kizil Irmak R.
Eskishehr
Kutaia
Yozgat
Zileh
Afiun Karahissar
Chivril
Buldur
Konia
Kaisariye
Gorun
Divrig
Egin
Arabkir
Dersim
Kharput
Palu
Keghy
Murad
Mush
Bitlis
Van
Bayazid
Nachitschewan
Julfa
Khoi
TABRIZ
Lake Urmia
Urmia
Bashkale
Sairt
Malatia
Diarbekr
Mardin
Urfa
Hadjin
Zeitoun
Marash
Sis
Aintab
ADANA
Tarsus
Mersina
Adalia
Iskanderun
Antakia
ALEPPO
CYPRUS British
Hamah
Homs
BEIRUT
DAMASCUS
Alexandria
Port Said
Cairo
Suez
Mosul
Arbel
Kerkuk
Tigris R.
Euphrates R.
BAGHDAD
Burudjird
Disful
Teheran
Basra

History and Politics

With a Portrait of Captain Cook. Crown 8vo. 6s.

The New World of the South : I. Australia in the Making.

By W. H. Fitchett, B.A., LL.D. Author of 'Fights for the Flag,' &c.

Public Opinion.—'Few men could "gather up the fragments into history's golden urn" in a more attractive style.'

Oxford Chronicle.—'A retrospect well worth the telling, and which could not have found a more faithful or picturesque narrator.'

II. The Romance of Australian History.

With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Times.—'Dr. Fitchett continues his story in a second volume, and in the same vigorous, picturesque style.'

Oxford Chronicle.—'A retrospect well worth the telling, and which could not have found a more faithful or picturesque narrator.'

With 8 Maps. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

Common Sense in Foreign Policy :

A Survey of its Present Outlines and its Possible Developments.

By Sir H. H. Johnston, G.C.M.G., K.C.B.

Author of 'The Uganda Protectorate,' 'The Nile Quest,' &c.

Scotsman.—'The plain unvarnished opinions of a practical mind, of a well-travelled man of affairs, on questions which sooner or later must call for solution by the Powers. The book is distinctly stimulating.'

Letters from the Near East. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

By the Honble. Maurice Baring.

Author of 'With the Russians in Manchuria,' &c.

Times.—'Mr. Baring records vividly and modestly the conditions of the Balkan countries as he saw them. By far the most moving chapter in the book is the description of the cholera hospital and camp at San Stefano—a tragic theme which impresses the more deeply because it is handled with restraint.'

2nd Edition. With 20 pages of Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

With the Bulgarian Staff. By Noel Buxton, M.P.

(Chairman of the Balkan Committee), Author of 'Europe and the Turks.'

The Globe.—'A very terrible book. It is war with the gilt off. But it is of the most absorbing interest, and no one who wishes to know what war really means should fail to read it.'

Large post 8vo. 6s. net.

Studies in British History and Politics.

By D. P. Heatley (Lecturer in History, University of Edinburgh).

Times.—'In his general reflection Mr. Heatley shows the philosophic temper, but in handling historical events and characters he shows a knowledge and a grasp of their significance which will commend the studies to the intelligent student.'

London : Smith, Elder & Co., 15 Waterloo Place, S.W.

Reminiscence and Travel

With a Portrait and an Illustration. Large post 8vo. 6s. net.

From the Porch.

Second Impression in the press.

By Lady Ritchie, Author of 'Old Kensington,' &c.

Pall Mall Gazette—'The best of her book turns on the Victorian era, which she so well represents in all its old-fashioned taste and gentleness and grace. It is as a living voice speaking of the literary giants of a past generation that the book stands by itself, triumphant and alone.'

Observer.—'Lady Ritchie leaves on us the impress of a kind of English Mme. Sévigné—quick, observant, witty, full of knowledge, discreet in her choice of material, and kindly to a fault in the mode of its expression.'

With Illustrations. Super royal 8vo. 15s. net.

In Thackeray's London. Pictures & Text.

By F. Hopkinson Smith.

With an Appreciation by one of Thackeray's Londoners, the Right Honble. Sir Algernon West, G.C.B.

Times.—'Mr. Hopkinson Smith is worth accompanying in his pilgrimage through Thackeray's London, if only to admire his excellent work as an artist.'

With a Portrait. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

Twenty-five Years.

By Katharine Tynan Hinkson, Author of 'Honey, My Honey,' &c.

Times.—'We have here a rich store of anecdotes and descriptions, told in a prose which is in itself a delight to read for its unstudied grace.'

Manchester Courier.—'An autobiography which, even if she had written nothing else, would entitle her to a place among the select list of living authors who count.'

With a Portrait. Large post 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

Labour, Life and Literature

Memories of Sixty Years.

By Frederick Rogers, Author of 'The Seven Deadly Sins,' 'Old Age Pensions,' etc.

Times.—'An interesting record, touching many phases of modern life besides the industrial, and introducing many men who distinguished themselves in social work, and told in an earnest straightforward style.'

Pall Mall Gazette.—'A vital and arresting record of a successful life devoted almost solely to the service of his fellow-men.'

India of To-day.

Demy 8vo. 6s net.

By E. C. Meysey Thompson, M.P.

Scotsman.—'He discusses many questions which are being debated at the present time, and shows in his book an extensive knowledge of the conditions through which he travelled.'

London: Smith, Elder & Co., 15 Waterloo Place, S.W.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A A 001 406 461 2

3 1210 00218 9221